

A
RELATION
OF THE
CONFERENCE
BETWEEN
William Laud,
Late Lord Arch-bishop of CANTERBURY,
AND
Mr. Fisher the Jesuite,

By the Command of King JAMES,
of ever-blessed Memory.

WITH

An ANSWER to such EXCEPTIONS
as A. C. takes against it.

The Third Edition Revised : with a TABLE annexed.

(by Robt Burton)



LONDON:

Printed by J. C. for Tho. Bassett, T. Dring, and J. Leigh,
at the George, the White Lion, and the Bell
in Fleet-street. MDC LXIII.

A
ELATION
 OF THE
CONFERENCE
 BETWEEN
William Laud
 Bishop of Canterbury of Canterbury
 AND
Mr. Higge the Cleric

By the Command of King James
 to his Excellency

An Answer to his Majesties
 as V. C. makes S. C. 1615.

To the Right Honourable Sir Thomas Egerton



London:

Printed for G. C. for Mr. Robert, T. Dering, and J. Peleg,
 at the George, in Fleet-street, near the Bell
 in Fleet-street. MDCXXVII.



To his Most

Sacred Majesty, CHARLES,

By the Grace of GOD,

KING of Great Britain, France and Ireland,
Defender of the Faith, &c.

DREAD SOVERAIGN:



HIS Tract will need Patronage, as Great as may be had, that's Yours. Yet, when I first Printed part of it, I presumed not to ask any, but thrust it out at the end of another's Labours, that it might seem, at least, to have the same Patron, your Royal Father of Blessed Memory, as the other Work, on which this attended, had. But now I humbly beg for it Your Majesties Patronage; And leave withal, that I

may declare to Your Most Excellent Majestie
the Cause why this Tract was then written : Why
it stay'd so long before it look'd upon the Light :
Why it was not then thought fit to go alone , but
rather be led abroad by the former Work : Why it
comes now forth both with Alteration , and Ad-
dition : And why this Addition made not more
haste to the Press , than it hath done .

The Cause why this Discourse was written,
was this : I was , at the time of these Conferences
with Mr. Fisher , Bishop of S. Davids ; And
not onely directed , but commanded by my bles-
sed Master King JAMES to this Conference
¶ May 24.
1622. with him . He , (a) when we met , began with a
great Protestation of seeking the Truth onely , and
that for it self . And certainly , Truth , especially in
Religion , is so to be sought , or not to be found . He

b One of these Biasses is an
Aversion from all such Truth
as fits not our Ends. And A-
versus à Veritate / iste , ab hac
luci Veritatis adversus (sic) &c.
S. Aug. l. 2. cons. Adversarium L-
egum & Prophet. And 'tis an easie
Transition , for a man that is
Averse from , to become adverse
to the Truth .

that seeks it with a Roman (b) Bias ,
or any (b) Other , will run Counter ,
when he comes near it , and not finde
it , though he come within kenning
of it . And therefore I did most bear-
tily wish , I could have found the Je-
suice upon that fair way he protested

to go . After the Conference ended , I went , whi-
ther my Duty called me , to my Diocels ; not suspe-
cting any thing should be made Publike , that was
both Commanded , and acted in Private . For W.L.
the Publisher of the Relation of the first Confe-
rence with D. White (the late Reverend and
Learned Bishop of Ely) (c) confesses plainly ,
That

c In the E-
pistle to the
Reader.

That M. Fisher was straightly charged upon his Allegiance, from his Majestie that then was, not to set out, or Publish what passed in some of these Conferences, till He gave License, and until Mr. Fisher and they might meet, and agree, and Confirm under their Hands, what was said on both sides. *He says farther, that (a)* ^a *Ibid.*
Mr. Fisher went to Dr. White's house, to know what he would say about the Relation, which he had set out. So then, belike Mr. Fisher had set out the Relation of that Conference, before he went to Dr. White, to speak about it. And this notwithstanding the Kings Restraint upon him, upon his Allegiance. Yet, to Dr. White it is said he went; but to what other end, than to put a Scorn upon him, I cannot see. For he went to his house to know, what he would say about that Relation of the Conference, which he had set out before.

In my absence from London, Mr. Fisher used me ^c These words were in my former Epistle.
as well. For with the same Care of his Allegiance, and no more, (c) he spread abroad Papers of this

checks at them, in defence of the Jesuite, and says: That the Jesuite did not at all so much as in Speech, and much less in Papers publish this, or either of the other two Conferences with Dr. White, till he was forc'd unto it by false report given out to his private disgrace, and the prejudice of the Catholike Cause. Nor then did he spread Papers abroad, but only delivered a very few Copies to special friends, and this not with an intent to calumniate the Bishop, &c. A.C. in his Preface before his Relation of this Conference. Truly, I knew of no Reports then given out to the prejudice of the Jesuite's either Person or Cause. I was in a Corner of the Kingdom, where I heard little. But howsoever, here's a most plain Confession by A.C. of that which he struggles to deny. He says he did not spread Papers. What then? What? Why he did but deliver Copies. Why but doth not he that delivers Copies (for instance, of a Libel) spread it? Yea, but he delivered but a very few Copies. Be it so; I do not say, how many he spred. He confesses the Jesuite delivered some, though very few; And he that delivers any, spreads it abroad: For what can he tell, when the Copies are once out of his power, how many may copie them out, and spread them farther? Yea, but he delivered them to special friends. Be it so too: The more special friends they were to him, the less indifferent would they be to me, perhaps my more special enemies. Yea, but all this was without an intent to calumniate me. Well: Be that so too. But if I be calumniated thereby, his intention will not help it. And whether the Copies, which he delivered, have not in them Calumny against me, I leave to the Indifferent Reader of this Discourse to judge.

Con-

Conference, full enough of partialitie to his Cause, and more full of Calumny against me. Hereupon I was in a manner forced to give M. Fisher's Relation of the Conference an Answer, and to publish it. Though for some Reasons, and those then approved by Authority, it was thought fit I should set it out in my Chaplain's Name R. B. and not in my own. To which I readily submitted.

There was a cause also, why at the first, the Discourse upon this Conference stayed so long, before it could endure to be pressed. For the Conference was in May, 1622. And M. Fisher's Paper was scattered and made common, so common, that a Copy was brought to me (being none of his special friends) before Michaelmas. And yet this Discourse was not printed till April, 1624. Now that you may know how this happened, I shall say for my self, It was not my Idleness, nor my Unwillingnes to right both my self, and the Cause, against the Jesuite, and the Paper, which he had spred, that occasion'd this delay. For I had then Most Honourable Witnesses, and bave some yet living, That this Discourse (such as it was, when A.C. nibbled at it) was finished long before I could perswade my self to let it come into Publike View. And this was caused partly by my own Backwardnes to deal with these men, whom I have ever observed to be great Pretenders for Truth, and Unity, but yet such as will admit neither, unless They and their Faction may prevail in all; As if no Reformation

tion had been necessary. And partly because there were about the same time three Conferences held with Fisher. Of these, this was the Third; And could not therefore conveniently come abroad into the world, till the two former were ready to lead the way; which till that time, they were not.

And this is in part the Reason also, why this Tract crept into the end of a larger Work. For since that Work contained in a manner the substance of all that passed in the two former Conferences; And that this third in divers points concurred with them, and depended on them; I could not think it Substantive enough, to stand alone. But besides this Affinity between the Conferences, I was willing to have it pass as silently as it might, at the end of another Work, and so perhaps little to be looked after, because I could not hold it worthy, nor can I yet, of that Great Duty, and Service, which I owe to my Dear Mother, the Church of England.

There is a cause also, why it looks now abroad again with Alteration and Addition. And 'tis fit I should give your Majesty an Account of that too. This Tract was first printed in the year 1624. And in the year 1626, another Jesuite, or the same, under the name of A. C. printed a Relation of this Conference, and therein took Exceptions to some Particulars, & endeavoured to Confute some Things deliver'd therein by me. Now being in years, and unwilling to die in the Jesuites debt, I have in this Second Edition done as much for him, and somewhat more. For he did but skip up and down, and labour

labour to pick a hole, here, and there, where he thought
he might fasten; and where it was too hard for him,
let it alone. But I have gone through with him; And
I hope, given a full Confutation: or at least such a
Bone to gnaw, as may shake his teeth, if he look not
to it. And of my Addition to this Discourse, this
is the Cause; But of my Alteration of some things
in it, this. A.C. his Curiosity to winnow me, made
me in a more curious manner fall to sifting of my self,
and that which had formerly past my Pen. And
though (I bless God for it) I found no cause to al-
ter any thing that belonged either to the Substance,
or Course of the Conference: Yet somewhat I did
find, which needed better, and clearer expression;
And that I have altered, well knowing I must expect
Curious Observers on all bands.

Now, Why this Additional Answer to the
Relation of A.C. came no sooner forth, hath a Cause
too, and I shall truly represent it. A.C. his Rela-
tion of the Conference, was set out, 1626. I
knew not of it in some years after. For it was prin-
ted among divers other things of like nature, either
by M. Fisher himself, or his friend A.C. When I
saw it, I read it over carefully, and found my self not
a little wrong'd in it; but the Church of England,
and indeed the Cause of Religion, much more. I
was before this time by Your Majesties Great
Grace, and undeserved favour, made Dean of Y our
Majesties Chappel Royal, and a Counsellor of
State, and hereby, as the Occasions of those times
were, made too much a Stranger to my Books. Yet
for

for all my Busie Implyments, it was still in my thoughts to give A.C. an Answer. But then I fell into a most dangerous Feaver; And though it pleased God beyond all hope to restore me to health, yet long I was before I recover'd such strength as might enable me to undertake such a Service. And since that time, how I have been detained, and in a manner forced upon other many, various, and Great Occasions, your Majesty knows best. And how of late I have been used by the Scandalous and Scurtious Pens of some bitter men (whom I heartily beseech God to forgive) the world knows; Little Leisure, and less Encouragement given me to Answer a Jesuite, or set upon other Services, while I am under the Prophets affliction, Psal. 50. between the Mouth that speaks wickedness, and the tongue that lets forth deceit, and slander me as thick, as if I were not their own Mothers Son. In the midst of these Libellous out-cries against me, some Divines of great Note and Worth in the Church came to me, One by One, and no One knowing of the Others Coming (as to me they protested) and persuaded ^{Psalm. 50. 19.} ^{20.} me to Reprint this Conference, in my own Name. This they thought would vindicate my Reputation, were it generally known to be mine. I confess I looked round about these Men, and their Motion; And at last, my Thoughts working much upon themselves, I began to persuade myself, that I had been too long diverted from this necessary Work. And that perhaps there might be In voce hominum, Tuba Dei, in the still voice

of men, the Loud Trumpet of God, which sounds
many wayes, sometimes to the ears, and sometimes to
the hearts of men, and by means which they think

* S. Aug. Sermon 63. De Di-
versis, c. 10. He speaks of
Christ disputing in the Temple with the Elders of the
Jews. And they heard Christ
the Essential Word of the
Father with admiration to
astonishment, yet believed him
not : S. Luk. 2. 47. And the
Word then spake to them by
a means they thought not of,
namely per Filium Dei in
puro, by the Son of God him-
self under the Vail of our hu-
man nature.

not of. And as * S. Augustine
speaks, A word of God there is, Quod
nunquam tacet, sed non semper
auditur : which though it be never
silent, yet is not always heard. That
it is never silent, is his great Mercy ;
and that it is not always heard, is not
the least of our Misery. Upon this
Motion I took time to deliberate :

And had scarce time for that, much
lesse for the Work. Yet at last to every of these men
I gave this Answer. That M. Fisher, or A.C. for
him, had been busie with my former Discourse, and
that I woul'd never reprint that, unless I might gain
time enough to Answer that, which A.C. had char-
ged a fresh both upon me, and the Cause. While
my Thoughts were thus at work, Your Majesty
fell upon the same Thing, and was graciously
pleased not to Command, but to Wish me to
reprint this Conference, and in mine own Name.
And thus openly at the Council-Table in Mi-
chaelmas-Terme. 1637. I did not bold it fit to
deny, having in all the Course of my service alwa-
ysed your Majesties Honourable, and First Na-
tions, as Commands: But Craved leave to
shew what little leasure I had to doe it, and what
Inconveniences might attend upon it. When this
did not serve to excuse me, I humbly submitted to that,
which

which I hope was Gods Motion in Your Majesties. And having thus layd all that Concerns this Discourse before your Gracious and most Sacred Majesty, I most bumbly present you with the Book it self, which as I heartily pray You to protect, so do I wholly submit it to the Church of England, with my Prayers for Her Prosperity, and my Wishes that I were able to do Her better Service.

I have thus acquainted Your Majesty with all Occasions, which both formerly, and now again have led this Tract into the light. In all which I am a faithful Relater of all Passages, but am not very well satisfied, who is now my Adversary. M. Fisher was at the Conference. Since that, I finde A.C. at the print. And whether These be two, or but One Jesuite, I know not; since scarce One amongst them, goes under One Name. But for my own part (and the Error is not great, if I mistake) I think they are One, and that One, M. Fisher. That which induces me to think so, is First, the Great Inwardness of A.C. with M. Fisher, which is so great, as may well be thought to neighbour upon Identity. Secondly, the Stile of A.C. is so like M. Fishers, that I doubt it was but one and the same hand that moulded the pen. Thirdly A.C. say expressly, That the Jesuite himself made the Relation of the first Conference with D. White: And in the Tidings Page of the Work, That Relation as well as This, is said to be made by A.C. and Published by W. J. therefore A.C. and the Jesuite are one and the same person, or else one of these places bath no Truth in it.

*Preface to
the Relation
of this Con-
ference by
A. C.

Now if it be M. Fisher himself, under the Name of A. C. then what needs these* words: The Jesuite could be content to let pass the Chap- Jains Censure, as one of his Ordinary persecu- tions for the Catholick Faith; but A. C thought it necessary for the Common Cause to defend the sincerity and Truth of his Relation, and the Truth of some of the Chieft Heads contained in it. In which Speech give me leave to observe to your Sacred Majesty, how grievously you suffer him, and his Fellows to be persecuted for the Catholick Faith, when your poor Subject and Serv- ant, cannot set out a true Copy of a Conference held with the Jesuite, justly Superiorum, but by & by the man is persecuted. God forbid I should ever offer to permake a Persecution in any kind, or pra- dise it in the least. For to my remembrance, I have not given him or his so much as courte Language. But on the other side, God forbid too, That your Majesty should let both Laws and Discipline sleep, for fear of the Name of Persecution, and in the mean time let M. Fisher and his Fellows Angle in all parts of your Domini- ons for your Subjects. If in your Grace and Goodness you will share their Persons: Yet I humbly beseech Your Majestie, That they be not suffer'd to lay either their Weals, or buis their Hooks, or cast their Nets in every stream, lest that Tempta- tion grow both too general, and too strong. I know they have many Devices to work their Ends; But if they will needs be fishing, let them use none but

*Lawful

* Lawful Nets. Let's have no dissolving of Oathes of Allegiance: No deposing, no killing of Kings: Noblowing up of States to settle Quod Volumus, that which fain they would have in the Church: with many other Nets, as dangerous as these. For if their Profession of Religion were as good, as they pretend it is, if they cannot compass it by Good Means, I am sure they ought not to attempt it by Bad. For if they will do evil, that good may come thereof, the Apostle tells me, Their Damnation's just. Rom. 3.

Now as I would bumbly Beseeche Your Majesty to keep a serious Watch upon these Fisher-men, which pretend S. Peter, but fish not with His Net: So wwould I not have You neglect another sort of Anglers in a Shalower Water. For they have some ill Nets too. And if they may spread them, when, and where they will, God knows what may become of it. These have not so strong a Back abroad, as the Romanists have, but that is no Argument to suffer them to encrease. They may grow to equal Strength with Number. And Factious People, at home, of what Sect, or fond Opinion soever they be, are not to be neglected. Partly, because they are so Near. And tis ever a dangerous Fire, that begins in the Bedstraw. And partly, because all those Domestick Evils, which threaten a Rent in Church or State, are with far more safety prevented by Wisdom, than punished by Justice. And would men consider it right, they are far more beholding to that man that keeps them from falling, than to him takes them up, though

* And S:
Aug. is very
full against
the use of
Mala res,
unlawful
Nets. And
saith, the
Fishermen
themselves
have great-
est cause to
take heed of
them. S.
Aug. L. de
Fide & Operis
l. 17.

Rom. 3. 8.

though it be to set the Arm or the Leg that's broken
in the Fall.

In this Discourse I have no aim to displease any,
nor any hope to please all. If I can help on to Truth
in the Church, and the Peace of the Church together,
I shall be glad, be it in any measure. Nor shall I
spare to speak necessary Truth, out of too much Love
of Peace. Nor thrust on Unnecessary Truth to the
Branch of that Peace, which once broken, is not so
easily solder'd again. And if for Necessary Truths
sake onely, any man will be offended, nay take, nay
snatch at that offence, which is not given, I know no
fence for that. This Truth, and I must tell it. This

^{1 Cor. 9.16.} the Gospel, and I must preach it. 1 Cor. 9. And far
safer it is in this Caesar to bear Anger from men, than
a Woe from God. And where the Foundations
of Faith are shaken, be it by Superstition or Pro-
phaneness, he that putteth on his band, as firmly as he
can to support them, is too wary, and hath more Care
of himself, then of the Cause of Christ. And it is
a Watineis that brings more danger in the end,
then it shuns.

For the Angel of the Lord issued
out a Curse against the Inhabitants of Meroz, be-
cause they came not to help the Lord to help the Lord
against the mighty. Judg. 5.

I know it is a Great
easie to let every Thing be as it will, and every man
believe, and do as he list. But whether Governors
in State or Church do their duty abewhile, is easily
seen, since this is an effect of no King in Israel,

Judg. 17.6. Judge 17.6. and of glibbedud armamentum regis, adgitat
The Church of Christ upon Earth may be
compared

compared to a Hive of Bees, and that can be no
where so steddy placed in this world, but it will be
in some danger. And men that care neither for the
Hive, nor the Bees, have yet a great mind to
the Honey. And having once tasted the sweet of
the Churches Maintenance swallow that for
Honey, which one day will be more bitter than Gall
in their Bowells. Now the King and the Priest,
more than any other, are bound to look to the Integrity
of the Church in Doctrine and Manners, and
that in the first place. For that's by farre the
Best Honey in the Hive. But in the second
place, They must be Careful of the Churches
Maintenance too, else the Bees shall make Hu-
ney for others, and have none left for their own ne-
cessary sustenance, and then all's lost. For we see it
in daily and common use, that the Honey is not taken
from the Bees, but they are destroyed first. Now
in this great and Busie Work, the King and the
Priest must not fear to put their hands to the Hive,
though they be sure to be stung. And stung by the
Bees, whose Hive and House they preserve. It was
King Davids Case (God grant it be never
Yours.) They came about me (saith the
Psal. 118.) *like Bees, This was hard usage enough,
yet some profic, some Honey might thus be gotten in
the End. And that's the Kings Case. But when
it comes to the Priest, the Case is alter'd. They come
about him like Walpes, or like Hornets rather, all
sting, and no Honey there. And all this many
times for no offence, nay sometimes for Service

Psal. 118.
12.
* Apum Si-
militudine
ardorem no-
sat vfa-
num; Non est
enim in illis
multum ro-
boris sed mi-
ra Excande-
scens :
Calv : in
Psal. 118.
done

done them, would they see it. But you know who said:
Behold I come shortly, and my reward is with
me, to give to every man according as his

Revel. 22. Works shall be. Revel. 22. And he himself

*Gen. 15.1. is so exceeding great a Reward, as that the mani-
fold stings which are in the World, howsoever they
smart here, are nothing when they are pressed out
with that exceeding weight of Glory, which shall

Rom. 8.18. be revealed: Rom. 8.

Now one Thing more let me be bold to Observe
to Your Majesty in particular, concerning Your
Great Charge, the Church of England. Tis in
an hard Condition. She professes the Ancient Ca-
tholike Faith: And yet she Romanist condemns
Her of Novelty in her Doctrine. She practises
Church-Government, as it hath been in use in all
Ages, and all Places, where the Church of Christ
hath taken any Rooting, both in, and ever since the
Apostles Times; And yet the Separatist con-
demns Her for Antichristianism in her Disci-
pline. The plain truth is, She is between these two
Factions, as between two Millstones: and unless
Your Majesty look to it, to Whose Trust She is
committed, She'll be ground to powder, to an irre-
pairable bothe Dishonour, and loss to this Kingdom.
And 'tis very Remarkable, that while both these
press hard upon the Church of England, both of
them Cry out upon Persecution, like froward Chil-
dren, which scratch, and kick, and bite, and yet
cry out all the while, as if themselves were killed.

Now to the Romanist I shall say this; The
Errors

Errors of the Church of Rome are grown now
(many of them) very Old. And when Errors
are grown by Age and Continuance to Strength, they
which speak for the Truth, though it be far Ol-
der, are ordinarily challenged for the Bringers in of
New Opinions. And there is no Greater Ab-
surdity stirring this day in Christendom, than
that the Reformation of an Old Corrupted
Church, will we, will we, must be taken for the
Building of a New. And were not this so, we
should never be troubled with that idle and imperti-
nent Question of theirs : Where was your
Church before Luther ? For it was just there,
where their's is now. * One and the
same Church still, no doubt of that.
One in Substance, but not One in
Condition of state and purity;
Their part of the same Church remain-
ing in Corruption : and Our part
of the same Church under Reforma-
tion. The same Naaman, and he a
Syrian still, but Leprous with them,
and Cleansed with us. The same
man still. And for the Separatist, and him that
lays his Grounds for Separation or Change of
Discipline, though all he says, or can say, be in
Truth of Divinity, and among Learned men little
better than ridiculous yet since these fond Opini-
ons have gain'd some ground among your people; it
is such among them as are wilfully set to follow their
blind Guides, through thick and thin, till * they

* There is no other difference
between us and Rome, than be-
twixt a Church miserably Cor-
rupted, and happily purged, &c.
Jof. Hall. B. of Exon. In his
Apologetical Advertisement to
the Reader, p. 192. Approved
by Thos. Morton, Bishop of Cov.
& Lich. now of Duresm. in the
Letters printed by the B. of Ex-
eter, in this Treatise called, The
Reconciler, p. 63. And D. Field.
in this Appendix to the third part.
c. 2. where he cites Calv. to
the same purpose, L. 4. Inst. c.
2. §. 11.

* S.Matt.

fall 15.14.

fall into the Ditch together, I shall say nothing.
But for so many of them, as mean well, and are only
misled by Artifice and Cunning; Concerning
them, I shall say thus much only: They are Bells of
passing good mettle, and tuneable enough of them-
selves, and in their own disposition; and a world of
pity it is, that they are Rung so miserably out of
Tune, as they are, by them which have gotten power
in and over their Consciences. And for this there is
yet Remedy enough; but how long there will be, I
know not.

Much talking there is (Bragging, Your Ma-
jesty may call it) on both sides. And when they are
in their ruff, they both exceed all Moderation, and
Truth too; So far, till both Lips and Pens open
for all the World like a Purse without money;
Nothing comes out of this, and that which is worth
nothing out of them. And yet this nothing is made
so great, as if the Salvation of Souls, that Great
work of the Redeemer of the World, the Son of
God, could not be effected without it. And while the
one faction cryes up the Church above the Scrip-
ture; and the other the Scripture to the neglect and
Contempt of the Church, which the Scripture is
self teaches men both to honour, and obey: They
have so far endangered the Belief of the One, and
the Authority of the Other, as that neither hath its
Due from a great part of Men. Whereas according
to Christ's Institution: The Scripture, where
tis plain, should guide the Church; And the
Church, were there's Doubt or Difficulty, should
expound

expound the Scripture; Yet so, as neither the Scripture should be forced, nor the Church so bound up, as that upon just and farther Evidence, She may not revise that which in any Case hath slipt by Her. What Success this Great Distemper caused by the Collision of two such Factions, may have, I know not, I cannot Prophesie. This I know, That the use which Wise men should make of other mens falls, is not to fall with them; And the use which Pious and Religious men should make of these great Flaws in Christianity, is not to Joyn with them that make them, nor to help to dislocate those main Bones in the Body, which being once put out of Joynt, will not easily be set again. And though I cannot Prophesie, yet I fear That Atheism, and Irreligion gather strength, while the Truth is thus weakened by an Unworthy way of Contending for it. And while they thus Contend, neither part Consider, that they are in a way to induce upon themselves, and others, that Contrary Extream, which they seem most both to fear, and oppole.

Besides: This I have ever Observed, That many Rigid Professors have turn'd Roman Catholiks, and in that Turn have been more Jesuited than any other: And such Romanists as have chang'd from them, have for the most part quite leaped over the Mean, and been as Rigid the other way, as Extremity it self. And this if there be not both Grace, and Wisdom to govern it, is a very Natural Motion. For a man is apt to think he can never run far enough from that, which he

once begins to hate; And doth not Consider therewhile,
That where Religion Corrupted is the thing he
hates, a Fallacy may easily be put upon him. For
he ought to hate the Corruption which depraves
Religion, and to run from it: but from no part of
Religion it self, which he ought to Love, and
Reverence, ought he to depart. And this I
have Observed farther: That no one thing
hath made Conscientious men more wavering
in their own mindes, or more apt, and
easie to be drawn aside from the sincerity of Reli-
gion professed in the Church of England,
than the Want of Uniform and Decent Or-
der in too many Churches of the Kingdom.
And the Romanists have been apt to say, The
Houses of God could not be suffer'd to lye so Na-
stily (as in some places they have done) were the
True worship of God observed in them: Or did
the People think that such it were. 'Tis true, the
Inward Worship of the Heart, is the Great
Service of God, and no Service acceptable with-
out it: But the External worship of God in his
Church is the Great Witness to the World,
that Our heart stands right in that Service of
God. Take this away, or bring it into Contempt,
and what Light is there left to shine before men,
that they may see our Devotion, and glorifie
our Father which is in Heaven: And to deal
clearly with Your Majesty, These Thoughts
are they, and no other, which have made me labour
so much, as I have done, for Decency and an
Orderly

Orderly settlement of the External Worship of
God in the Church. For of that which is Inward
there can be no Witness among men, nor no Ex-
ample for men. Now no External Action in the
world can be Uniform without some Ceremo-
nies. And these in Religion, the Ancienter they
be, the better, so they may fit Time and Place.
Too many Over-burden the Service of God,
And too few leave it naked. And scarce any Thing
hath hurt Religion more in these broken Times,
than an Opinion in too many men, That because
Rome had thrust some Unnecessary, and many Su-
perstitions Ceremonies upon the Church, therefore
the Reformation must have none at all; Not
considering therewhile, That Ceremonies are the
Hedge that fence the Substance of Religion from
all the Indignities, which Prophaneness and Sacri-
lege too Commonly put upon it. And a Great
Weakness it is, not to see the Strength which Cere-
monies (Things weak enough in themselves, God
knows) adde even to Religion it self; But a
far greater to see it, and yet to Cry Them down,
all, and without Choyce, by whicb their most hated
Adversaries climb'd up, and could not crie up them-
selves, and their Cause, as they do, but by them. And
Divines of all the rest might learn, and teach this
Wisdom if they would, since they see all other
Professions, which help to bear down their Cere-
monies, keep up their own therewhile, and that to
the biggest.

I have been too bold to detain Your Majesty so
long;

long; But my Grief to see Christendom bleeding
in Dissention, and which is worse, triumphing in her
own Blood, and most angry with them, that would
study her Peace, hath thus transported me. For truly
it Cannot but grieve any man, that hath Bowels, to
see All men seeking, but as S. Paul foretold, Phil.

Phil. 2. 21. 2. their own things, and not the things which
are Jesus Christs. Sua, Their own surely. For
the Gospel of Christ hath nothing to do with them:
And to see Religion so much, so Zealously preten-
ded, and called upon, made but the Stalking-Horse,
to shoot at other Fowl, upon which their Aim is set;
In the mean time, as if all were Truth and Holiness
is self, no Salvation must be possible, did it lye at their
Mercy, but in the Communion of the One, and in
the Conventicles of the Other. As if either of these
now were, as the Donatists of old repudged them-
selves, the only men, in whom Christ at his coming
to Judgment, should find Faith. No (saith *d.
Augustine:and so say I with him) Da veniam,
non Credimus. Pardon us, I pray, we cannot be-
lieve it. The Catholike Church of Christ is nei-
ther Rome, nor a Conventicle. Out of that there's
no Salvation, I easily confess it. But out of Rome
there is, and out of a Conventicle too; Salvation is
not shut up into such a narrow Conclave. In this
ensuing Discourse therefore I have endeavour'd to lay
open those wider Gates of the Catholike Church,
confined to no Age, Time, or Place; Nor know-
ing any Bounds, but That Faith, which was
once (and but once for all) deliver'd to the Saints.

* S. Aug.
Epist. 48.

S. Jude 3.

S. Jude 3. And in my pursuit of this way, I have s. Jud. 3.
searched after, and deliver'd with a single heart, that
Truth which I profess. In the publishing whereof,
I have obeyed Your Majesty, discharge'd my Duty,
to my power, to the Church of England. Given * 1 S. Pet. 3.
account of the Hope that is in me; And so testi- 15.
fied to the world that Faith in which I have lived,
and by God's blessing and favour purpose to dye; But
till Death shall most unfainedly remain,

Your MAJESTIES

Most faithful Subject,

And

Most Humble and Obliged Servant,

W. C A N T.

YOM MAJESTIES

Beide Ich ist Atem

六三

W.M. Hall Company, Inc., 1900

W. C. A. n. t.



A
RELATION
 OF THE
CONFERENCE
 BETWEEN
WILLIAM L A W D,
 Then L. Bishop of S. DAVIDS, afterwards
 Lord Arch-Bishop of CANTERBURY;
 AND
M. F I S H E R the JESUITE.

F. *The occasion of this Conference was.*

B. The occasion of this *Third Conference* you §. I.
 should know sufficiently. You were an *Author* in it, as well as in two other. Whether you have related the two former truly, appears by D. White, the late Reverend L. Bishop of Ely his Relation, or Exposition of them. I was present at none but this *Third*; of which I here give the Church an *Account*. But of this *Third*, whether that were the Cause which you alledge, I cannot tell. You say,

F. *It was observed, That in the second Conference all the Speech was about particular matters, little or none about a continual, infallible, visible Church; which was the chief and only Point in which a certain Lady required satisfaction; as having formerly settled in her minde, That it was not for her, or any other unlearned persons, to take upon them to judge of particulars, without depending upon the judgment of the True Church.*

2
 §. 2. B. The Opinion of that Honourable Person in this, was never opened to me. And it is very fit the people should look to the Judgment of the Church, before they be too busie with Particulars. But yet neither ^a Scripture, nor any good Authority, denies them some moderate use of their own understanding and judgment, especially in things familiar and evident; which even ordinary Capacities may as easily understand, as read.

^b *Quis non sine ullo Magistro, aut interprete ex se facili cognoscatur, &c.*

Novat. de Trin. c. 23. *Et laetus de mysterio Passione Christi. Dijudicare est Mensurare, &c. unde & mens dicitur à metendo. Thos. p. 1. q. 79. a. 9. ad 4.* To what end then is a Mind and an Understanding given a man, if he may not apply it to measure Truth? *Et si dico a mī dico scirem. i. ab eo quod considerat, & discernit. Quia decernit inter verum & falsum. Damasc. l. 2. Fid. Orth. c. 22.*

And A. C. himself, p. 41. denies not all Judgment to private men; but says, They are not so to rely absolutely upon their private judgment, as to adventure Salvation upon it alone, or chiefly:

which no man will deny.
 F. This Lady therefore having heard it granted in the first Conference, That there must be a continual visible Company ever since Christ, teaching unchanged Doctrine in all Fundamental Points, that is, Points necessary to Salvation; desired to hear this confirmed, and proof brought, which was that continual, infallible, visible Church, in which one may, and out of which one cannot attain Salvation. And therefore having appointed a time of Meeting between a B. and Me, and therupon having sent for the B. and Me; before the B. came, the Lady, and a Friend of hers, came first to the Room where I was, and debated before me the aforesaid Question; and not doubting of the first part, to wit, That there must be a continual visible Church, as they had heard granted by D. VVhite, and L. K. &c.

§. 3.
 NUM. 1. B. VWhat D. White and L. K. granted, I heard not: But I think, both granted a continual, and a visible Church; neither of them an Infallible, at least in your sense. And your self, in this Relation, speak distractedly: For in these few lines from the beginning hither, twice you add Infallible between continual and visible, and twice you leave it out. But this concerns D. W. and he hath answered it.

NUM. 2.
 A. C. p. 42. Here A. C. steps in, and says, The Jesuite did not speak distractedly, but most advisedly: For (faith he) where he relates what D. VVhite or L. K. granted, he leaves out the word Infallible, because they granted it not; But where he speaks of the Lady, there he addes it, because the Jesuite knew, it was an Infallible Church which she sought to rely upon. How far the Catholick Militant Church of Christ is Infallible, is no Dispute for this place, though you shall finde it after. But sure the Jesuite did not

not speak most advisedly, nor *A.C.* neither, nor the *Lady* her self, if she said she desired to relye upon an *Infallible Church*. For att *Infallible Church* denotes a *Particular Church*, in that it is set in opposition to some other Particular Church that is not Infallible. Now I, for my part, do not know what that *Lady* desired to relye upon. This I know, if she desired such a *Particular Church*, neither this *Jesuite*, nor any other, is able to shew it her: No, not *Bellarmino* himself, though of very great ability to make good any Truth which he undertakes for the Church of *Rome*. + But no strength can uphold an Error against *Truth*, where *Truth* hath an able Defendant. Now where *Bellarmino* sets himself purposely to make this good, That * *the Particular Church of Rome cannot erre in matter of Faith*: Out of which it follows, That there may be found a *Particular Infallible Church*; you shall see what he is able to perform.

non potest. S. Aug. in Psal. 61.

* *L. 4. de Rom. Pont. Cap. 4. §. 1. Romana particularis Ecclesia non potest errare in Fide.*

+ *Veritas vincat necesse est, sive Negantem, sive constanter, &c.*
S. Aug. Epist.

174.
Occultari potest ad tempus veritas, vinci

I First then, after he hath distinguished, to express his N U M. 3. meaning, in what sense the *Particular Church of Rome* cannot erre in things which are *de Fide*, of the Faith: He tells us, this *Firmitude* is, because the *Sea Apostolick* is fixed there. And this he saith is most true. * And for proof of it, he brings * *Ibid* §. 2. three Fathers to justify it.

I The first Saint *Cyprian*, + whose words are, That the *Romans* are such, as to whom *Perfidia* cannot have access. Now *Perfidia* can hardly stand for Error in *Faith*, or for *Misbelief*; but it properly signifies Malicious Falshood, in matter of *Trust*, and *Action*; not Error in *Faith*, but in *Fact*, against the Discipline and Government of the *Church*. And why may it not here have this meaning in *S. Cyprian*?

+ *Navigant audent ad Petri Cathedram, & Ecclesiam Principalem, &c. Nec cogitare nos esse Romanos, ad quas Perfidia habere non potest accessum.* *Cyprian. L. 1. Epist. 3.*

For the Story there, it is this: * In the Year 255, there was a *Council* in *Carthage* in the Cause of two Schismatics, *Felicissimus*, and *Novatian*, about restoring of them to the *Communion* of the *Church*, which had lapsed, in time of danger, from *Christianity* to *Idolatry*. *Felicissimus* would admit all, even without *Penance*; and *Novatian* would admit none, no not after *Penance*. The Fathers, forty two in number, went as the *Truth* led them, between both Extremes. To this *Council* came *Privatus*, a known Heretick, but was not admitted, because he was formerly *Excommunicated*, and often condemned. Hereupon he gathers his Complices together, and chuses one *Fortunatus* (who was formerly condemned as well as himself) *Bishop of Carthage*, and set him up against *S. Cyprian*. This done, *Felicissimus* and his Fellows haste to *Rome* with Letters Testimonial

N U M. 4.
* *Bis. concil. Tom. 1. p. 152. Edit. Parf. 1636. Baron. Annal. 253, 254, 255.*

from their own Party, and pretend that twenty five Bishops concurred with them; and their desire was to be received into the Communion of the Roman Church, and to have their new Bishop acknowledged. Cornelius, then Pope, though their haste had now prevented S. Cyprian's Letters, having formerly heard from him, both of them and their Schism in Africk, would neither hear them, nor receive their Letters. They grew insolent and furious (the ordinary way that Schismatics take.) Upon this Cornelius writes to S. Cyprian, and S. Cyprian in this Epistle gives Cornelius thanks for refusing these African Fugitives, declares their Schism and wickedness at large, and encourages Him, and all Bishops, to maintain the Ecclesiastical Discipline and Censures, against any the boldest threatening of wicked Schismatics. This is the Story; and in this is the Passage here urged by Bellarmine. Now I would fain know why *Perfidia* (all circumstances considered) may not stand here in its proper sense for *cunning* and *perfidious dealing*, which these men, having practised at Carthage, thought now to obtrude upon the Bishop of Rome also, but that he was wary enough not to be over-reach'd by busie Schismatics.

NUM. 5.

2. Secondly, Let it be granted that *Perfidia* doth signify here *Error in Faith and Doctrine*. For I will not deny, but that among the African Writers (and especially S. Cyprian) it is sometimes so us'd; and therefore here perhaps. But then this Priviledge of not erring dangerously in the Faith, was not made over absolutely to the Romans, that are such by Birth, and dwelling only; but to the Romans, *qua tales*, as they were such as those first were, whose Faith was famous through the World, and as long as they continued such; which at that time it seems they did. And so S. Cyprian's words seem to import, *eos esse Romanos*, that the Romans then under Pope Cornelius, were such

* Rom. 1.8. as the * Apostle spake of; and therefore to whom at that time (or any time, they still remaining such) *perfidious misbelief* could not be welcom; or rather indeed, *perfidious Misbelievers or Schismatics*, could not be welcom. For this very Phrase, *Perfidia non potest habere accessum*, directs us to understand the word in a Concrete sense: *Perfidiousness could not get access*, that is, *such perfidious persons*, Excommunicated out of other Churches, were not likely to get access at Rome, or to finde admittance into their Communion: It is but a Metonymie of speech, the

Adjunct for the Subject, a thing very usual in *Elegant + Authors*, and much more in later times; as in S. Cyprian's, when the Latine Language was grown rougher. Now if it be thus understood (I say in the *Concrete*) then it is plain, that S. Cyprian did

† Ego tibi istam scismatam, Scelus, lin-
quam abscondam: Plaut. Amphit. Ex
bac enim parte pudor pugnat, illuc pe-
tulantia, &c. Cic. — Latuit pietro te-
tus amictu Omnis Honos. Nullus comi-
tata est purpura fasces. Lucan. L. 2.

not intend by these words to exempt the Romans from possibility

lity of Error, but to brand his Adversaries with a Title due to their Merit, calling them *Perfidious*, that is, such as had betrayed, or perverted the Faith. Neither can we loose by this Construction, as will appear at after.

3. But thirdly, When all is done, what if it be no more then NUM. 6.

a Rhetorical excess of speech? *Perfidia non potest*, for *non facile potest*; It cannot, that is, it cannot easily: Or what if S. Cyprian do but *Laudando precipere*, by commanding + them to be + such, instruct them, that such indeed they ought to be, to whom *Perfidiousness* should not get access. Men are very bountiful of their Complements sometimes. *

Syntaxis writing to *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*, begins thus: *ἰηδοὺς διὰ βίαιου, ἡράσταντο οὐδεὶς*, &c.

I both will, and a Divine Necessity lies upon me, to esteem it a Law, whatsoever *that Throne* (meaning his of *Alexandria*) shall determine. Nay the word is *πνευματικόν*, and that signifies to determine like an Oracle, or as in Gods stead. Now, I hope you will say, this is not to be taken *Dogmatically*, it is but the Epistolers Courtesie only. And why not the like here?

For the haste which these *Schismatics* made to *Rome*, prevented S. Cyprian's Letters: yet *Cornelius* very careful of both the *Truth* and *Peace* of the Church, would neither hear them, nor receive their Letters, till * he had written to S. Cyprian. Now this Epistle is S. Cyprian's Answer to *Cornelius*, in which he informs him of the whole truth, and withal gives him thanks for refusing to hear these *African Fugitives*.

In which fair way of returning his thanks, if he make an Honourable mention of the *Romans*, and their *Faith*, with a little dash of *Rhetorick*, even to a *Non potest*, for a *Non facile potest*, 'tis no great wonder.

But take which Answer you will of the three; this is plain, NUM. 7.

that S. Cyprian had no meaning to assert the unerring *Infallibility* of either *Pope*, or *Church of Rome*. For this is more then manifest, by the Contestation which after happened between S. Cyprian, and Pope Stephen, about the *Rebaptization of those*

that were Baptized by Hereticks; For he

* *faith expressly, That Pope Stephen did then not only maintain an Error, but the very Cause of Hereticks, and that against Christians, and the very Church of God.*

+ *And after this he chargeth him with Obstinacy and Presumption: I hope this is plain enough to shew, that S. Cyprian had no great*

Opinion of the Roman Infallibility: Or if he had it, when he writ to Cornelius; certainly he had chang'd it, when he wrote against Stephen. But I think it was no change; and that when he wrote to Cornelius, it was Rhetorick, and no more.

*Nec cogitare
eos esse Roma-
nos, quorum
fides Apostolo
predicanti, &c.
Epist. 67.*

* For so S. Cyprian begins his Epistle to *Cornelius*. *Legi literas tuas frater, &c.* And after: *Sed enim lecta alia Epistola tua frater, &c. S. Cypr. L. 1. Epist. 3.*

* *Stephanus Frater noster Hereticorum causam contra Christianos, & contra Eccliam Dei afferere conatur. Cypr. ad Pompeium contra Epist. Stephani Edit. per Erasmum Basil. p. 327.*

+ *Stephani fratri nostri oblitatio dura. Ibid. p. 329. And it would be marked by the Jesuite and his A. C. that still it is Stephanus fratri nostri, and not Capitis, or summi Pastoris nostri.*

Now

NUM. 8.

Now if any man shall say, that in this Point of *Rebaptizati-*
on S. Cyprian himself was in the wrong Opinion, and Pope
Stephen in the right, I easily grant that; but yet that Error
of his takes not off his judgment, what he thought of the *Pa-*
pal or Roman Infallibility in those times. For though after-
wards * S. Cyprian's Opinion was condemned in a *Council* at
Rome under *Cornelius*, and after that by Pope *Stephen*; and
after both, in the first † *Council of Carthage*: yet no one word is
there in that *Council*, which mentions this as an Error, *That*
he thought Pope Stephen might Err in the Faith, while he pro-
claimed he did so. In which, though the particular Censure
which he passed on Pope *Stephen* was erroneous (for *Stephen*
erred not in that) yet the *General* which results from it (name-
ly, that for all his being in the Popedom, he might erre) is
most true.

NUM. 9.

2 The second Father which Bellarmine cites is Saint Jerome:

* Attamen scitum Romagan fidem Apolo-
licā voce laudatam eysmodi præstigia
non recipere, etiamq; Angelus alter an-
nunciet, quād semper predicatione est, Pauli
Authoritate muniam non posse mutari.
S. Hieron. L. 3. *Apol. contra Ruffinum.*
Tom. 2. Edit. Paris. 1534. fol. 84. K.
Peradventure it is here to be read
(& jam s.) For so the place is more
plain, and more strong, but the An-
swer is the same.

† Deinde ut Epistol. ad Ori-
entem mittent, & cauterium tibi Heresios
inuertit. Dicentesq; libros Originis uocē
ἀρχῶν, à te translatos, & simplici E-
cclesia Romana plebi traditos, ut fidei
veritatem quam ab Apostolo didicerant,
per te perdarent. S. Hieron. ibid. fol. 85. K.

the verity of the *Faith*, which they had learned from the *Apostle*. Therefore the *Præstigia* before-mentioned, were the cunning illusions of *Ruffinus*, putting *Origen's Book* under the *Martyr Pamphilus* his name, that so he might bring in *Heresie* the more cunningly under a name of Credit, and the more easily pervert the peoples *Faith*. So, of the *Faith* he speaks. And secondly, I shall as easily confess that S. *Jerom's* speech is most true, but I cannot admit the *Cardinal's* sense of it: for he imposes upon the word *Fides*. For by *Romana Fides*, the *Roman Faith*, he will understand the particular *Church of Rome*; which is as much as to say, *Romanos Fideles*, the *Faithful* of that *Church*: And that no wilily delusions, or counseilage in matter of *Faith* can be imposed upon them. Now hereupon I return to that of S. *Cyprian*: If *Fides Romana* must signifie *Fideles Romanos*, why may not *Perfidia* before signifie *Perfidios*? Especially since these two words
are

are commonly used by these *Writers*, as Terms
 * *Opposite*: And therefore by the *Law of Opposition* may interpret each other proportionably. So with these great Masters, with whom 'tis almost grown to be, *Quod voluntus, rectum est*, what we please, shall be the Authors meaning: *Perfidia* must signifie absolutely *Error in Faith, Misbelief*; but *Fides* must relate to the *Persons*, and signifie the *Faithful of the Roman Church*. And now I conceive my Answer will proceed with a great deal of Reason. For *Romana Fides*, the *Roman Faith*, as it was commended by the Apostle (of which S. Jerome speaks) is one thing; and the *Particular Roman Church*, of which the *Cardinal* speaks, is another. The *Faith* indeed admits not *Prestigium*, wily delusions into it; if it did, it could not be the *whole and undefiled Faith of Christ*, which they learned from the *Apostle*; and which is so fenced by *Apostolical Authority*, as that it cannot be changed, though an *Angel* should preach the contrary. But the *Particular Church of Rome* hath admitted *Prestigium*, divers crafty Conveyances into the *Faith*, and is not fenced, as the *Faith it self* is. And therefore though an *Angel* cannot contrary that, yet the *bad Angel* hath sowed Tares in this. By which means *Romana Fides*, though it be now the same it was for the *words* of the *Creed*; yet it is not the same for the *sense* of it: nor for the *super and preter-structures* built upon it, or joyned unto it. So the *Roman Faith*, that is, the *Faith* which S. Paul taught the *Romans*, and after commended in them, was all one with the *Catholike Faith of Christ*. For S. Paul taught no other then that *One*; and this one can never be changed in, or from it self, by *Angel* or *Devil*. But in mens hearts it may receive a change; and in particular Churches it may receive a change; and in the *particular Church of Rome* it hath received a change. And ye see S. Hierome himself confesses, that the *Pope* himself was afraid + ne perderent, lest by this Art of *Ruffinus*, the people might lose the verity of the *Faith*. Now that which can be lost, can be changed: For usually Habits begin to alter, before they be quite lost. And that which may be lost among the *People*, may be lost among the *Bishops*, and the rest of the *Clergy* too, if they look not to it, as it seems they after did not at *Rome*, though then they did. Nay, at this time the whole *Roman Church* was in danger enough to swallow *Origen's Book*, and all the Errours in it, coming under the name of *Pamphilus*: And so S. Hierome himself exprely, and close upon the place cited by *Bellarmino*. For he desires * *Ruffinus to change the Title of the Book* (that Errour may not be spread under the specious name of *Pamphilus*) and so to free from danger the *Roman Simplicity*. Where, by

+ *Qui cum Fidei dux esset non poterit perfidia extitit.* S. Cyprian. L. 1. Epist. 7.
Fidem perfidi. &c. Ibid.
Facti sunt ex Oribus Vulpes, ex fidelibus perfidi. Optatus. L. 7. *Quoniam iis proficiuntur Parentum Fides, quorum iis non potest obesse perfidia.* S. Aug. Epist. 23. *Quando potius Fides aliena potest confundere parvulo, cui sua perfidia,* &c. S. Aug. L. 3. de lib. Arbit. c. 23.

+ *Ne fidei visitationem quam ab Apostolo didicrant, perire perderent,*
ut supra.

* *Data tunc
 iussi de Roma
 nam simplici-
 tatem tanto
 pericula liberat.*
Ibid. fol. 84. R.

by the way, *Roman unerring Power* now challenged, and *Roman Simplicity*, then feared, agree not very well together.

NUM. 10. 3 The third Father alledged by Bellarmine, is S. * Gregory

⁴ *Vetus Roma ab antiquis temporibus habet rectam Fidem, & semper eam retinet, sicut docet Iuribem, que toto Orbi praesedit, semper deo integrum fidei habere. Greg. Naz., in Carmine de vita sua. Ante mediam. p. 9. Edit. Paris. 1609.*

Nazianzen. And his words are: That Ancient Rome from of old hath the right Faith, and always holds it, as becomes the City, which is Governess over the whole World, to have an entire Faith in, and concerning God. Now certainly it became that

City very well, to keep the Faith sound and entire. And having the Government of a great part of the World then in her power, it became her so much the more, as her Example thereby was the greater. And in S. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s time, *Rome* did certainly hold both *rectam & integrum Fidem*, the right, and the whole entire Faith of Christ. But there is nor *Promisse*, nor *Prophecie* in S. *Gregory*, that *Rome* shall ever so do. For his words are plain, *debet semper*, it becomes that great City always to have, and to hold too, *integrum Fidem*, the entire

Faith. But at the other *semper*, 'tis + *retinet*, that City from of old holds the right Faith yet : But he saith not, *retinebit semper*, that the *City of Rome* shall retain it ever, no more then it shall ever retain the Empire of the World. Now it must be asfur'd, that it shall ever hold the entire Faith

of Christ, before we can be assured, that that particular Church can never *Erre*, or be *Infallible*.

NUM. II. Besides these, the *Cardinal* names *Cyrillus*, and *Ruffinus*; but he neither tells us where, nor cites their words. Yet I think I

* Petram opinor per agnoscendum vobis
aliquid, quid non concubinorum & firmissimam
Discipuli fidem vocavit. Ita quid, Ecclesie
Christi ita fundata & firmata est,
ut non labretur, & esse inexpugnabilis
inferiorum portis, in perpetuum manens.
S. Cyril. Alex. Dial. de Trin. l. 4-
p. 278. Parisiis, An. 1604.

* S. Cyril, and that makes clearly against him. For I finde exprely these three things. *First*, That the Church is Inexpugnable, and that the *Gates of Hell* shall never prevail against it, but that it shall *in perpetuum manere*, remain for ever. And this all Protestants agree. But this *Theatrum Bellum ad eum*

itants grant. But this, *That it shall not fall away*, doth not secure it from all kinds of Error. Secondly, Bellarmine quotes S. Cyril for the particular Roman Church; and S. Cyril speaks not of the Roman at all, but of the Church of Christ, that is, the Catholike Church. Thirdly, that the

**[¶] Ex ego dico tibi] i tua confessionis, quia
mibi dixisti. Tu es Christus, &c. Dion.
Carthus. in S. Mat. 16.18. Ex super hanc
Petram] i. Fidei huius firmataem & su-
bamentum. Vt super hanc Petram quem
confessus es, i. super Petrum Lapidem
Angularem, &c. Ibid.**

Foundation and firmness which the Church of Christ hath, is placed not *in*, or *upon* the

[†] Person, much less the Successor of S. Peter; but upon the [†] Faith, which by God's Spirit in him he so firmly professed: which is the common received Opinion both of

the *Ancient Fathers*, and the *Protestants*. Upon this Rock, that is, upon this Faith, will I build my Church, S. Matth. 16. So S. Mat. 16.18, here's all the good he hath gotten by S. Cyril, unless he can cite some other place of S. Cyril, which I believe he cannot.

And for *Ruffinus*, the place which *Bellarmino* aims at, is in NUM. 12. his Exposition upon the *Creed*; and is quoted in part, the * Chapter before. But when all his words shall be laid together, they will make no more for *Bellarmino* and his Cause, then the former places have done.

* Ruffinus his words then run thus: Before I come to the words of the Creed, this I think fit to warn you of, that in divers Churches some things are found added to the words (of the Creed.) But in the Church of the City of Rome, this is not found done: And as I think, it is, for that no Heresie did take its rise or beginning there: And for that the Old Custom is there observed, namely, that they which are to receive the grace of Baptism, do publickly repeat the Creed in the hearing of the people, who would not admit such Additions. But in other places (as far as I can understand) by reason of some Hereticks, some things were added, but such as were to exclude the sense of their Novel Doctrine. Now these words make little for *Bellarmino* who cites them, and much against *Ruffinus* that uttered them. They make little for *Bellarmino*. First, because suppose *Ruffinus* his speech to be true, yet this will never follow: In *Ruffinus* his time no Heresie had taken its beginning at *Rome*: therefore no Heresie hath had rooting there so many hundred years since. Secondly, *Bellarmino* takes upon him there to prove, That the particular Church of Rome cannot Erre. Now neither can this be concluded out of *Ruffinus* his words. First, because (as I said before) to argue from Non sumpsit, to Ergo sumere non potest: No Heresie hath yet begun there; therefore none can begin there, or spring thence, is an Argument drawn ab Actu ad Potentiam negative, from the Act to the Power of Being; which every Novice in Learning can tell proceeds not Negatively. And common reason tells every man, 'tis no consequence to say, Such a thing is not, or hath not been, therefore it cannot be. Secondly, because though it were true, that no Heresie at all did ever take its beginning at *Rome*, yet that can never prove, that the particular Church of Rome can never Erre (which is the thing in Question.) For suppose that no Heresie did ever begin there, yet if any that began elsewhere were admitted into that Church, it is as full a proof, that that Church can Erre, as if the Heresie had been hatched in that Nest. For that Church

* Bellar. L. 4. de Nom. Pont. Cap. 3.
S. penult.

+ Illud non importund commonendum puto,
quod in diversis Ecclesiis aliqua in his
verbis inveniuntur adiecta. In Ecclesia
tamen urbis Romae hoc non debet existi-
factum. Pro eo arbitror, quod utique Her-
esies ultra illuc sumpsit exordium, & mos
ibi seruatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam
Baptismi suscepunt sunt, publico, id est,
Fidelium populo audiente, Symbolum redi-
dere. Et utique adjectioem unius saltem
Sermonis, eorum qui precesserunt in Fide,
non admittit auditus. In ceteris autem
Locis, quantum intelligi datur, propter
sonnulos Hereticos addita quedam vi-
denter, per que novilla Doctrine sensus
credereatur excludi, &c. Ruffin. in Exposit.
Symbol. (ut habetur inter Opera S. Cypr.
ani) Prefat. Expos.

main Point of *Faith*, the *Canon of Scripture*, and is absolutely convinced not to be Infallible: for if she were right in her reckoning then, she is wrong now; and if she be right now, she was wrong then: and if she do not reckon more now than she did when *Ruffinus* lived, then he reckons fewer than she, and so dissents from her; which doubtless he durst not have done, had he thought her judgment *Infallible*. Yea, and he sets this mark upon his Dissent besides,* That

he reckons up the Books of the Canon just so, and no otherwise, then as he received them out of the Monuments of the Fore-fathers; and out of which the Assertions of our Faith are to be taken.

* Novi & Veteris Testimenti Volumina, &c. sicut ex Patrum Monumentis acceptimus. Russ. in Symb. p. 188. Et hec sunt que Patres intra Canum conculserunt. Et ex quibus Fidei nostrae Assertiones constare voluerunt. Ib. p. 189.

Last of all, had this place of *Ruffinus* any strength for the *Infallibility* of the *Church of Rome*, yet there is very little reason that the *Pope* and his *Clergy* should take any Benefit by it.

For † *S. Hierome* tells us, *That when Ruffinus was angry with him for an Epistle which he writ not, he plainly sent him to the Bishop of Rome, and bid him exposulate with him for the Contumely put upon him, in that he received not his Exposition of the Faith, which, said he, all Italy approved: And in that he branded him also, dum nesciret (be-binde his back) with Heretice.* Now if the *Pope*, which then was, rejected this Exposition of the *Creed* made by *Ruffinus*, and branded him besides with *Heretice*; his Sentence against *Ruffinus* was *just*, or *unjust*: If *unjust*, then the *Pope* erred about a matter of *Faith*; and so neither he, nor the *Church of Rome*, *Infallible*: If *just*, then the *Church of Rome* labours to defend her self by his Pen, which is judged *Heretical* by her self. So whether it were *just*, or *unjust*, the *Church of Rome* is driven to a hard strait, when she must beg help of him whom she branded with *Heretice*, and out of that Tract which she her self rejected; and so uphold her *Infallibility* by the judgment of a man, who in her judgment had erred so foully: Nor may she by any * Law take benefit of a *Testimony*, which her self hath defamed, and protested against.

With these *Bellarmino* is pleased to name *six* or ^a *seven Popes*, which, he saith, are all of this Opinion. But of Popes Opinions, he saith, That ^b these *Testimonies will be contemned by the Heretics*. Good words, I pray. I know whom the *Cardinal* means by *Heretics* very well: But the best is, his Call cannot make them so. Nor shall I easily contemn *seven Ancient Bishops of Rome* concurring in Opinion, if apparent Verity in

N U M. 13.
a Lib. 4. c. 3. §.

De altero er-

go.

b Que et si ab

Hereticis con-

temnentur. L. 4.

c. 4. §. Addo

etiam.

the thing it self do not force me to dissent ; and in that case I shall do it without contempt too. This only I will say, * That seven Popes concurring in Opinion, shall have less weight with me in their own Cause, than any other seven of the more Ancient Fathers. Indeed could I swallow † Bellarmine's Opinion, *That the Pope's Judgment is Infallible*, I would then submit without any more ado. But that

* *Nomini in sua causa credendum, nisi conformiter ad Legem Divinam, Naturalem & Canonicas loquar. So Jo. Germon, and the Doctors of Paris, cited in Lib. Anon. de Ecclesiastica & Politica Pontificata. c. 16. Ed. Paris. 1612. Now these Popes do not speak here conformably to these Laws.*
† *Lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 3. in initio.*

will never down with me, unless I live till I dote, which I hope in God I shall not.

NUM. 14. Other Proofs then these *Bellarmino* brings not to prove, that the particular Church of Rome cannot erre in, or from the Faith. And of what force these are to sway any judgment, I submit to all indifferent Readers. And having thus examined *Bellarmino*'s Proofs, *That the particular Church of Rome cannot erre in Faith*; I now return to A.C. and the Jesuite, and tell them, that no Jesuite, or any other, is ever able to prove any particular Church Infallible.

A.C. p. 42. NUM. 15. But for the particular Church of Rome, and the Pope with it, erred it hath ; and therefore may erre. Erred I say it hath in the Worship of Images, and in altering Christ's Institution in the Blessed Sacrament, by taking away the Cup from the People ; and divers other particulars, as shall appear at * after. & 12. And as for the Ground which is presumed to secure this

* *S.33. Con-*
fid. 7. Num. 5.
& 12. *Romana Ecclesia Particularis non potest errare, persistente Roma Apostolica Sede. Propositione hec est verissima, & fortasse tam vera quam illa prima de Pontifice. L.4. de Rom. Pont. c. 4. S.2. Edit. Lugdun. 1596. And that first Proposition is this : Summus Pontifex cum totam Ecclesiam docet, in his que ad fidem pertinent salvo casu errari posset. Ibid. t.3. §.1.*

Church from Error, 'tis very remarkable how the † Learned Cardinal speaks in this Case. For he tells us, that this Proposition [so long as St. Peter's Chair is at Rome, that particular Church cannot erre in the Faith] is verissima, most true ; and yet in the very next words, 'tis Fortasse tam vera, peradventure as true as the former (that is)

*That the Pope when he teaches the whole Church in those things which belong to the Faith, cannot erre in any case. What ? is that Proposition most true ? And yet is it but at a peradventure 'tis as true as this ? Is it possible any thing should be absolutely most true ; and yet under a peradventure that it is but as true as another Truth ? But here without all Peradventure neither Proposition is true. And then indeed *Bellarmino* may say without a *Fortasse*, That this Proposition, The particular Church of Rome cannot erre, so long as the See Apostolike is there, is as true as this : The Pope cannot erre while he teaches the whole Church in those things which belong to the Faith. For neither of them is true. But he cannot say that either of them is verissima, most true, when neither of them hath Truth.*

NUM. 16. 2 Secondly, if the particular Church of Rome be Infallible, and

and can neither erre in the Faith, nor fall from it, then it is because the *Sea Apostolike* cannot be transferred from *Rome*, but must ever, to the *Consummation of the World*, remain there, and keep that *particular Church* from erring. Now to this what says *Bellarmino*? What? Why he tells us, † That it is a pious, and most probable Opinion to think so. And he reckons four Probabilities, that it shall never be remov'd from *Rome*. And I will not deny, but some of them are fair Probabilities; but yet they are but Probabilities, and so unable to convince any man. Why but then, what if a man cannot think as *Bellarmino* doth, but that inforced by the light of his Understanding, he must think the quite contrary to this, which *Bellarmino* thinks pious, and so probable? What then? Why then * *Bellarmino* himself tells you, that the quite contrary Proposition to this, namely, That *s. Peter's Chair may be severed from Rome, and that then that particular Church may erre, is neither Heretical, nor manifestly Erroneous*. So then, by *Bellarmino's own Confession*, I am no Heretick, nor in any manifest error, if I say (as indeed I do, and think it too) that 'tis possible for *S. Peter's Chair* to be carried from *Rome*, and that then at least, by his own Argument, that Church may erre.

Now then upon the whole matter, and to return to *A. C.*
If that Lady desired to rely upon a *particular Infallible Church*,
'tis not to be found on earth. *Rome* hath not that gift, nor her
Bishop neither. And *Bellarmino* (who I think was as able as
any Champion that Church hath) dares not say, 'tis either *Heretick*, or a *manifest error*, to say, That the *Apostolike Sea* may
be removed thence, and that *Church not only erre in Faith, but also fall quite away from it*. Now I, for my part, haye not
ignorance enough in me to believe, that that *Church* which
may *Apostatize* at some one time, *may not erre* at another; es-
pecially since both her erring and failing may arise from other
Causes besides that which is mention'd by the *Cardinal*. And
if it *may erre*, 'tis not *Infallible*.

NUM. 17.
A. C. p. 42.

† *Pia & probabilissima Sententia est, Cathedram Petri non posse separari a Româ, & prouide Romanam Ecclesiam absolute non posse errare, vel deficere.*
L. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 4. §. Quod nihilominus.

* *Contraria sententia nec est Heretica, nec manifeste erronea. L. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 4. §. At secundum.*

F. The Question was, Which was that Church? A Friend of the Ladies would needs defend, That not only the Roman, but also the Greek Church was right.

B. When that Honourable Personage answered, I was not by to hear. But I presume, he was so far from granting, that only the *Roman Church* was right, as that he did not grant it right: and that he took on him no other defence of the poor *Greek Church*, then was according to truth.

§. 4.

F. I told him, That the Greek Church had plainly changed, and taught false in a Point of Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost, and that I had heard say, that even his Majesty should say, That the Greek Church having erred against the Holy Ghost, had lost the Holy Ghost.

§. 5.

B. You are very bold with His Majesty, to relate him upon Hear-say. My intelligence serves me not to tell you what His Majesty said: But if he said it not, you have been too credulous to believe, and too sudden to report it. Princes deserve, and were wont to have more respect then so. If His Majesty did say it, there is Truth in the speech; the Errour is yours only, by mistaking what is meant by *losing the Holy Ghost*. For a particular Church may be said to lose the *Holy Ghost* two ways, or in two degrees. 1 The one, when it loses such special assistance of that Blessed Spirit, as preserves it from all dangerous Errours and sins, and the temporal punishment which is due unto them: And in this sense the *Greek Church did perhaps lose the Holy Ghost*: for they erred against him, they sinned against God. And for this, or other sins, they were delivered into another *Babylonish Captivity* under the *Turk*, in which they yet are; and from which, God in his mercy deliver them. But this is rather to be called an Errour *circa Spiritum Sanctum*, about the Doctrine concerning the *Holy Ghost*, then an Errour against the *Holy Ghost*. 2 The other is, when it loses not only this assistance, but all assistance *ad hoc*, to this, that they may remain any longer a *true Church*; and so, *Corinth* and *Ephesus*, and divers other Churches have *lost the Holy Ghost*; but in this sense the whole *Greek Church* lost not the *Holy Ghost*. For they continue a true Church in the main substance, to and at this day, though Erroneous in this Point which you mention, and perhaps in some other too.

§. 6.

F. The Ladies Friend not knowing what to answer, called in the Bishop, who sitting down first, excused himself as one unprovided, and not much studied in Controversies; and desiring that in case he should fail, yet the Protestant Cause might not be thought ill of.

B. This is most true. For I did indeed excuse my self, and I had great reason so to do. And my Reason being grounded upon *Modesty*, for the most part, there I leave it. Yet this it may be fit others should know, that I had no information where the other Conferences brake off; no instruction at all what should be the ground of this third Conference, nor the full

full time of four and twenty hours to bethink my self. And this I take upon my Credit is most true : whereas you make the sifting of these , and the like *Questions*, to the very *Bran*, your daily work , and came throughly furnished to the busi- ness , and might so lead on the Controversie to what your self pleased , and I was to follow as I could. * S. Augustine * *De util. credendi. c. 2.*

F. It having an hundred better Scholars to maintain it then he. To which I said, there were a thousand better Scholars then I to maintain the Catholike Cause.

B. In this I had never so poor a Conceit of the *Protestants Cause* , as to think, that they had but an hundred better then my self to maintain it. That which hath an hundred , may have as many more, as it pleases God to give , and more then you. And I shall ever be glad , that the *Church of England* (which, at this time, if my memory reflect not amiss, I named) may have far more able Defendants then my self. I shall never envy them, but rejoice for her. And I make no question, but that if I had named a thousand , you would have multi- plied yours into ten thousand, for the *Catholike Cause* (as you call it.) And this confidence of yours hath ever been fuller of noise then proof. But you proceed.

§. 7.

F. Then the Question about the Greek Church being propo- sed, I said as before, that it had erred.

B. Then I think the Question about the Greek Church was proposed. But after you had with confidence enough not sparing to say, That what I would not acknowledge in this Cause, you would wring and extort from me ; then indeed you said as before, that it had erred : And this no man denied. But every Error denies not Christ , the Foundation; or makes Christ deny it, or thrust it from the Foundation.

§. 8.

F. The Bishop said, That the Error was not in Point Fun- damental.

B. I

§. 9.
NUM. 1.

B. I was not so peremptory. My speech was, That divers Learned men, and some of your own, were of Opinion, that (*as the Greeks expressed themselves*) it was a Question not simply Fundamental. I know, and acknowledge that Error of denying the *Procēssion of the Holy Ghost from the Son*, to be a *grievous Error* in Divinity. And sure it would have grated the Foundation, if they had so denied the *Procēssion of the Holy Ghost from the Son*, as that they had made an inequality between the Persons. But since their form of speech is, *+ That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son, and is the Spirit of the Son*, without making any difference in the *Consubstantiality of the Persons*; I dare not deny them to be a *true Church* for this; though I confess them an *erroneous Church* in this particular.

NUM. 2.

b Pluralitas in Voce, salutā unitate in re, non repugnat unitati Fidei. Durand. Lub. 3. d. 25. q. 2.
c Magist. 1. Sent. d. 11. D. Sanè scientiam est, q' o' l' licet in praesenti Article a nobis Greci verbo discordat, tamen sensu non differant. &c. Bandinus L. 1. de Trin. d. 11.
& Bonavent. in 1. Sent. d. 11. A. 1. q. 1.
S. 12. Licet Greci insensim, quām dixit Grecos

objicere curiaſitatem Romanis, addendo (Filioq;) Quia per hujus Articlei professione salus erat; non Respondere negando salutem est, sed dicit tamē opportunam fuisse Determinationem propter periculum. Et postea, S. 15. Sunt qui volunt sustinere opinionem Graecorum, & Latinorum, distinguendo duplē modū Procedendi.

Sea forte si duo sapientes, unus Grecus, alter Latinus, uterque verius amator Veritatis, & non proprie dictionis, &c. de hac via contrarietate discurrerent, pataret, utique tandem ipsam Contrarietatem non esse veraciter realē, sicut tibi Vocabū. Scotus in 1. Sent. d. 11. q. 1. Antiquorum Graecorum & Latinus discrepantia in voce potius est, & modo explicandi Emanationem Sp. S. quam in ipsa re, &c. Jodocus Cisticoverus in Damasc. L. 1. Fid. Orth. c. 11. Et quidam ex Graecis concident, quād sit à Filio, vel ab eo profusat. Thom. p. 1. q. 36. A. 2. c. Et Thomas ipse dicit, Sp. S. procedere mediatis à Filio. Ib. A. 3. ad 1. saltem ratione Personarum Spirantium. Respondeo cum Bellarmino, & Gennadio, Damascenum nos negasse Sp. S. procedere ex Filio, quod ad rem attinet, quān dixerit Spiritum esse Imaginem Filii, & per Filium, sed extrinsecus talibus dici per Filium, quād ex Filio, quantum ad modum loquendi, &c. Bellarm. L. 2. de Christo, c. 27. S. Respondeo igitur. Et Toller, in S. John 14. Ar. 25. & Lutheran. Rep. ad Rep. 2. Jeremie Patriarche. d Eadem penitus sententia, ubi supra, Cisticov. e Bellarm. 4. de Notis Eccl. cap. 8. S. Quod autem apud Graecos.

NUM. 3.

It ought to be no easie thing to condemn a man of Heresie, in foundation of faith; much less a Church; least of all so ample

ple and large a Church as the Greek, especially so, as to make them *no Church*. *Heaven Gates* were not so easily shut against multitudes, when S. Peter wore the *Keys* at his own Girdle. And it is good counsel which * *Alphonsus a Castro*, one of your own, gives: *Let them consider that pronounce easily of Heretie, how easie it is for themselves to erre*. Or if you will pronounce, consider what it is that separates from the Church simply, and not in part only, I must needs profess, that I wish heartily, (as well as † others) that those distressed men, whose Cross is heavy already, had been more plainly and moderately dealt withal, though they think a diverse thing from us, then they have been by the *Church of Rome*. But hereupon you say you were forc'd:

* Lib. 3. cont.
Heres. fol. 93.
A. ut vident
bi, qui facile
de Heretis pro-
nuntiant, quam
facile etiam
ipso erent: Et
intelligant, non
esse tam leviter
de Heretis cae-
sendum, &c.
In verbo [Bea-
titudo.]
† Junius Ani-
mad in Bellar.
cont. 2. L. 3.
c. 23.

F. *Whereupon I was forced to repeat what I had formerly brought against D. White, concerning Points Fundamental.*

B. Hereupon it is true, that you read a large Discourse out of a Book printed, which, you said, was yours; the particulars (all of them at the least) I do not now remember, nor did I then approve. But if they be such as were formerly brought against Doctor *White*, they are by him formerly answered. The first thing you did, was the * *righting* of S. *Augustine*; which Sentence I do not at all remember was so much as named in the Conference, much less was it stood upon, and then righted by you. Another place of S. *Augustine* indeed was (which you omit;) but it comes after, about *Tradition*, to which I remit it. But now you tell us of a great Proof made out of this † place: For these words of yours contain two Propositions: One, *That all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental*: The other, *That this is proved out of this place of S. Augustine*.

* F. First righting the Sentence of S. *Augustine*: *Ferendus est Disputator errans, &c.* Here A.C. p. 44, tells us very learnedly, that my corrupt Copy hath *righting* instead of reading the Sentence of S. *Augustine*. Whereas I here use the word *righting*, not as it is opposed to reading (as any man may discern A. C. palpably mistakes) but for doing right to S. *Augustine*. And if I had meant it for *writing*, I should not have spelled it so.

† By which is proved, That all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental.

I For the first, *That all Points defined by the Church are fundamental*: It was not the least means, by which *Rome* grew to her Greatness, to blast every Opposer she had with the Name of *Heretick*, or *Schismatick*; for this served to shrivel the Credit of the persons. And the persons once brought into contempt and ignominy, all the good they desired in the Church, fell to dust, for want of Creditable Persons to back and support it. To make this proceeding good in these later years, this course (it seems) was taken. The *school*, that must maintain (and so they do) *That all Points defined by the Church, are thereby a Fundamental, b necessary to be believed, c of the substance of the Faith*; and that,

D

though

a Your own word.

b *Inconcusse fide ab omnibus*. Thom. 2.

2^o. q. 1. Art. 10. C.

c *Scotus 1. Sent. 4. II. q. 1.*

*d Ecclesi Ph-
ces etiam ex-
tra Scriptu-
ram. Stap.
Relig. Con. 4.*

q. 1. Ar. 3. Quia maturo iudicio definitur, &c. Solidum est, & etiam si nulla Scripturarum, aut evidenti, aut probabili testimonio confirmaretur. Ibid.

c Et penit Circeps Victoria sit, Greg. Naz. de Differen. vita. Circeps 1. Altitos, & vesterioris improbitatis Episcopos, qui artibus suis ac dolis omnia Concilia perturbabant. Schol. ib.

NUM. 3.

But since these men distinguish not, nor you, between the *Church in general*, and a *General Council*, which is but her *Representation* for determinations of the Faith ; though I be very slow in sifting or opposing what is concluded by Lawful, General, and consenting Authority ; though I give as much as can justly be given to the Definitions of Councils truly General : Nay, suppose I should grant (which I do not) *That General Councils cannot erre* ; yet this cannot down with me, *That all Points even so defined are Fundamental*. For *Deductions* are not prime and native *Principles* ; nor are *Superstructures Foundations*. That which is a *Foundation for all*, cannot be one, and another, to different Christians in regard of it self ; for then it could be no common *Rule* for any, nor could the Souls of men rest upon a *shaking foundation*. No : If it be a true *foundation*, it must be *common to all*, and *firm under all* ; in which sense the *Articles of Christian Faith are fundamental*.

* *Quum enim una & eadem fides sit,
neque se qui multum de ipsa dicere potest,
plusquam operat, dicit; neque qui parvo
ipam immittit. Iren. L. 1. advers. He-
re. c. 3.*

And * *Irenaeus* lays this for a ground, *That the whole Church (howsoever dispersed in place) speaks this with one mouth. He, which among the Guides of the Church is best able to speak, utters no more than this ; and less than this, the most simple*

doth not utter. Therefore the Creed (of which he speaks) is a common, is a constant Foundation. And an Explicite Faith must be of this, in them which have the use of Reason ; for both Guides, and simple people, all the Church utter this.

NUM. 4.

Now many things are defined by the *Church*, which are but *Deductions* out of this : which (suppose them deduced right) *move far from the foundation* ; without which *Deductions* explicitly believed, many millions of Christians go to Heaven ; and cannot therefore be *fundamental in the Faith*. True *Deductions* from the *Article* may require necessary belief, in them which are able, and do go along with them from the Principle to the Conclusion. But I do not see, either that the *Learned* do make them necessary to *all*, or any reason why they should. Therefore they cannot be *fundamental* ; and yet to some mens Salvation they are necessary.

NUM. 5.

Besides, that which is *fundamental* in the *Faith of Christ*, is

is a *Rock immoveable*, and can never be varied. Never *. Therefore, if it be fundamental after the Church hath defined it, it was fundamental before the Definition, else it is moveable; and then no Christian hath where to rest. And if it be immovable, as indeed it is, no Decree of a Council, be it never so General, can alter immovable Verities, no more then it can change immovable Natures. Therefore if the Church in a Council define any thing, the thing defined is not fundamental, because the Church hath defined it; nor can be made so by the Definition of the Church, if it be not so in it self. For if the Church had this power, she might make a new Article of the Faith, * which the Learned among your selves deny: For the Articles of the Faith cannot increase in substance, but only in Explication *. And for this, I'll be judg'd by Bellarmine, + who disputing against Amb. Catharinus about the certainty of Faith, tells us, That Divine Faith hath not its certainty, because 'tis Catholike, i. common to the whole Church; but because it builds on the Authority of God, who is Truth it self, and can neither deceive, nor be deceived. And he adds, That the Probation of the Church can make it known to all, that the Object of Divine Faith is revealed from God, and therefore certain, and not to be doubted; but the Church can add no certainty, no firmness to the Word of God revealing it.

Nor is this hard to be farther proved out of your own School; NUM. 6. for * Scotus professeth it in this very particular of the Greek Church: If there be (saith he) a true real difference between the Greeks and the Latines, about the Point of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, then either they or we be verè Hæretici, truly and indeed Hereticks. And he speaks this of the old Greeks, long before any Decision of the Church in this Controversie: For his instance is in S. Basil, and Greg. Nazianz. on the one side, and S. Hierome, Augustine, and Ambrose, on the other. And who dares call any of these Hereticks? is his challenge. I deny not, but that Scotus adds there, That howsoever this was before, yet ex quo, from the time that the Catholike Church declared it, it is to be held as of the substance of Faith. But this cannot stand with his former Principle, if he intend by it, That whatsoever the Church defines, shall be ipso facto, and for that Determinations sake Fundamental. For if before the

* Reolutio Occhami est, quod nec tota Ecclesia, nec Concilium Generale, nec summus Pontifex potest facere Articulum, quod non sit Articulum. Sed in dubiis Propositionibus potest Ecclesia determinare, an sint Catholice, &c. Tamen sic determinando non facit quod sint Catholice, quum prius essent ante Ecclesiæ Determinationem, &c. Almain. in 3. D. 25. Q. 1.

+ Regula Fidei una omnia est, sola illa immobilia, & irreformabilia. Tertul. de Virg. v. l. cap. 1. In hac fide, &c. Nihil transmutare, &c. Athan. Epist. ad Jovin. de Fide.

* Oceham.
Almain. in 3.
Sent. D. 25. q. 1.

* Thom. 2.2. q. 1. art. 7. c.

+ Fides Divina non ideo habet certitudinem, quia tota Ecclesia communis est: sed quia nimirum Authoritate Dei, qui nec fallit, nec fallere potest, quum sit ipsa Veritas. L. 3. de Justif. c. 3. S. Quod vero Concilium. Probatio Ecclesie facit ut omnibus innoget Objectum (Fidei Divine) esse revelatum a Deo, & propter hoc certum & indubitatum; non autem tribuit firmatum verbo Dei aliquid revulsum. Ibid. 5. At inquit.

* Scotus in 1.
Sent. D. 11.
q. 1.

Determination (supposing the Difference real) some of those *Worthies* were truly *Hereticks*, (as he confesses) then somewhat made them so. And that could not be the Decree of the Church, which then was not : Therefore it must be somewhat really false, that made them so ; and *fundamentally false*, if it made them *Hereticks against the Foundation*.

^a Bellarm. L. 2. de coac. Amb. c. 12.
Concilium tunc definitus, non faciunt aliquid esse infallibiliter veritatis, sed declarant. Explicare, Bonavent. is 1. d. 11.
A. 1. q. 1. ad finem. Explanari, declarari. Tho. 1. q. 36. A. 2. ad. 2. & 2. 2. q. 1.
A. 10. ad. 1.

^b Quid unquam aliud (*Ecclesia*) *Concilio-*
rum decretis eiusa est, nisi ut quod annis
simpliciter credebat, hoc idem posse
diligenter credere. Vm. Lyr. contra her.
c. 32.

^a Sent. 1. D. 11. ^b Alb. Mag. ^c Att. 7.

^d Now the ^a Master teaches, and the ^b Scholars too, That every thing which belongs to the Exposition or Declaration of another, *intus est*, is not another contrary thing, but is contained within the Bowels and nature of that which is interpreted : from which, if the *Declaration* depart, it is faulty and erroneous ; because instead of declaring, it gives another, and contrary ^c sense. Therefore, when the Church declares any thing in a Council, either that which she declares, was *intus*, or *extra* ; *in the nature and verity of the thing, or out of it*. If it were *extra*, without the nature of the thing declared, then the Declaration of the thing is false, and so, *far from being fundamental in the Faith* ^d. If it were *intus*, within the compass and nature of the thing, though not open and apparent to every eye ; then the *Declaration* is true, but not otherwise fundamental, then the thing is which is declared : for that which is *intus*, cannot be larger or deeper then that in which it is ; if it were, it could not be *intus*. Therefore nothing is simply fundamental, because the Church declares it, but because it is so in the

^c Non semper,
nec quicquam
prosternit. Vm.
Lyr. c. 32.

^d In novâ Heresi *Veritas prius erat de Fide, et non ipsa declarata. Scotus in 1.*
D. 11. q. 1. in fin. Heretici multa que-
erant implicita fidei nostrâ, computarent
explicare. Bonavent. in 1. D. 11. A. 1.
Q. 1. ad finem. Tho. 1. q. 36. A. 2. ad. 2.
Quamvis Apostolica Sedis, aut Generale
Concilium de Heresi censert possit, non tam-
amen id est. Assertionem aliqua erit Heresi,
quia Ecclesia definivit, sed quia Fiducia
Catholica repugnat. Ecclesia sicutdem sua
definitione non facit talum Assertionem esse
Heresi, quam etiam si ea non definisset,
est Heresi; sed id sufficit ut patet ex.
Alphon. à Castro L. 1. Advers. Her.
c. 2. fol. 21. D.

nature of the thing, which the Church declares.

^a NUM. 8. And it is a slight and poor Evasion that is commonly used, that the *Declaration* of the Church makes it Fundamental, *quodam nos*, in respect of us ; for it doth not that neither : For no respect to us can vary the *Foundation*. The Churches Declaration can binde us to Peace, and External Obedience, where there is not express Letter of *Scripture*, and sense agreed on ; but it cannot make any thing fundamental to us, that is not so in its own Nature. For if the Church can so adde, that it can by a *Declaration* make a thing to be fundamental

mental in the Faith, that was not; then it can take a thing away from the foundation, and make it by declaring, not to be Fundamental; which all men grant, no power of the Church can do. + For the power of adding any thing contrary, and of detracting any thing necessary, are alike forbidden and alike denied. Now nothing is more apparent, then this, to the eye of all men, That the Church of Rome hath determined, or declared, or defined (call it what you will) very many things, that are not in their own nature fundamental; and therefore neither are, nor can be made so by her adjudging them. Now to all this discourse, that the Church hath not power to make any thing fundamental in the Faith, that intrinsically, and in its own nature is not such, A.C. is content to say nothing.

2 For the second, That it is proved by this place of S. Augustine, NUM. 9.

That all points defined by the Church are fundamental. You might have given me that place cited in the Margin, and eased my pains to leek it; but it may be there was somewhat in concealing it. For you do so extraordinarily right this place, that you were loth (I think) any body should see how you wrong it. The place of S. Augustine is this, against the Pelagians, about Remission of Original Sin in Infants: * This is a thing founded: an erring Disputer is to be born with in other Questions not diligently digested, not yet made firm by full Authority of the Church, their error is to be born with: but it ought not to go so far, that it should labour to shake the foundation it self of the Church. This is the place: but it can never follow out of this place (I think) That every thing defined by the Church is fundamental.

For first, he speaks of a foundation of Doctrine in Scripture, NUM. 10. not a Church-definition. This appears: for few lines before, he tells us, * There was a Question moved to S. Cyprian, Whether Baptism was concluded to the eighth day, as well as Circumcision? And no doubt was made then of the b beginning of sin, and that c out of this thing, about which no Question was moved, that Question that was made, was Answered. And d again, That S. Cyprian took that which he gave in Answer from the foundation of the Church, to confirm a stone that was shaking. Now S. Cyprian in all the Answer that he gives, hath not one word of any Definition of the Church: therefore e a res, that thing by which he answered, was a Foundation of prime and settled Scripture-Doctrine, not any Definition of the Church: Therefore, that which he took out of the Foundation of the Church, to fasten the stone that shook, was not a Definition of the Church, but the Foundation of the Church it self, the Scripture,

+ Ecclesia non
amputat necesse
saria, non ap-
ponit superflua.
Vin: Lyr. c. 32.
* Deut. 4.2.
* Thom. Supp.
q. 6. A. 6. C.

* August. Serm. 14. de verb. Apoll. c. 12.
Fundata res est. In aliis Questionibus
non diligenter digestis, nondum plena Ec-
clesie autoritate firmatis ferendus est
Disputatio errans: ibi ferendus est error,
non tantum progrexi debet, ut etiam Fun-
damentum ipsius Ecclesie quatenus molitur.

b Origine
Peccati.

c Ex eare,
unde nulla erat
Questio, soluta
est exorta
Questio.

d Hoc de Fun-
damento Eccl-
esiae sumpit ad
confirmandum
Lapidem un-
tatem.

e concil. Millevit c.2.
pture, upon which it is builded: as appeareth in the *Milevitan Council*; where the *Rule*, by which *Pelagius* was condemned, is the *Rule of Scripture*: Therefore *S. Augustine* goes on in the same sense, That the Disputer is not to be born any longer, that shall endeavour to shake the foundation it self, upon which the whole Church is grounded.

f Rom. 5.15.
g ut Funda-
mentum opum
Ecclesie qua-
tore militare.
NUM. 11.

h 1 Tim. 3.15

i Mos funda-
tissimus
S. Aug Ep. 28.

k Staple. Re-
lief. cont. 4.
q 3.4.1.

1 Quae quidem, si tam manifesta manifra-
tur, ut in dubium venire non possit, propon-
enda est omnibus illis rebus, quibus in
Catholico tenor. Ita si aliquid specifi-
cum in Evangelio. S. August. contra
Fund. 6.4.

NUM. 12.

Secondly, If *S. Augustine* did mean by *Founded*, and *Foundation*, the *definition* of the *Church*, because of these words, *This thing is founded, this is made firm by full Authority of the Church*; and the words following these; *to shake the foundation of the Church*; yet it can never follow out of any, or all these Circumstances (and these are all) *That all points defined by the Church, are fundamental in the Faith*. For first, no man denies, but the *Church* is a ^h *Foundation*; That things defined by it, are founded upon it: And yet hence it cannot follow, That the thing that is so founded, is Fundamental in the Faith: For things may be ⁱ *founded upon Humane Authority*, and be very certain, yet not Fundamental in the Faith. Nor yet can it follow, *This thing is founded, therefore every thing determined by the Church, is founded*. Again that which follows, That those things are not to be opposed, which are made firm by full Authority of the *Church*, cannot conclude, they are therefore Fundamental in the Faith. For full *Church-Authority* (always the time that included the *Holy Apostles* being past by, and not comprehended in it) is but *Church-Authority*; and *Church-Authority*, when it is at Full Sea, is not ^j *simply k Divine*, therefore the Sentence of it not *fundamental* in the Faith. And yet no erring Disputer may be induced to *shake the foundation*, which the *Church in Council* lays. But *plain Scripture with evident sense*, or a full *demonstrative Argument* must have room, where a wrangling and erring Disputer may not be allowed it. And there's ^l neither of these, but may convince the Definition of the Council, if it be ill founded. And the *Articles of the Faith* may easily prove it is not Fundamental, if indeed and verily it be not so.

And I have read some-body that says (is it not you?) *That things are fundamental in the Faith two ways*: One, in their *Matter*, such as are all things which be so in themselves; The other, in the *Manner*, such as are all things that the *Church* hath defined, and determined to be of Faith: And that so, some things that are *de modo*, of the *manner of being*, are of Faith. But in plain truth, this is no more, then if you should say, Some things are *fundamental in the Faith*, and some are not. For wrangle while you will, you shall never be able to prove, that any thing which is but *de modo*, a consideration of the *manner*

manner of being only, can possibly be fundamental in the Faith.

And since you make such a Foundation of this place, I will NUM. 13. a little view the Mortar with which it is laid by you. It is a venture, but I shall finde it ^a untempered. Your Assertion is : ^b Ezek. 13.11 All Points defined by the Church are fundamental. Your proof, this place: Because that is not to be shaken, which is settled by ^b full Authority of the Church. Then (it seems) your meaning ^b Plena Ecclesie Authoritate. is, that this point there spoken of, *The remission of Original Sin in Baptism of Infants*, was defined, when S. Augustine wrote this, by a full Sentence of a General Council. First, if you say it was: ^c Bellarmine will tell you, it is false; and that the Pelagian Heresie was never condemned in an Oecumenical Council, ^c L. 2. de Author. Concil. c. 9 but only in Nationals. But Bellarmine is deceived: For while ^d A folis particularibus. the Pelagians stood out impudently against National Councils, some of them defended Nestorius; which gave occasion to the first ^d Ephesine Council to Excommunicate, and depose them. ^d C. 1. & 4. And yet this will not serve your turn for this place. For S. Augustine was then dead, and therefore could not mean the Sentence of that Council in this place. Secondly, if you say, it was not then defined in an Oecumenical Synod; Plena Authoritas Ecclesie, the full Authority of the Church there mentioned, doth not stand properly for the Decree of an Oecumenical Council, but for some National; as this was condemned in a ^e National Council. ^e Concil. Afric. viti. Cap. 2. And then the full Authority of the Church here, is no more then the full Authority of the Church of ^f Africk. And I hope that Authority doth not make all Points defined by it to be fundamental. You will say, Yes: if that Council be confirmed by the Pope. And then I must ever wonder, why S. Augustine should say, *The full Authority of the Church*, and not bestow one word upon the Pope, by whose Authority only that Council, as all other, have their fulnes of Authority in your Judgment. An inexpiable Omission; if this Doctrine concerning the Pope were true.

But here A.C. steps in again to help the Jesuite; and he tells NUM. 14. us, over and over again, That all points made firm by full Authority of the Church are fundamental; so, firm he will have them, and therefore fundamental. But I must tell him: That first, 'tis one thing in Nature, and Religion too, to be firm; and another thing to be fundamental. These two are not convertible. 'Tis true, that every thing that is fundamental, is firm: But it doth not follow, that every thing that is firm, is fundamental. For many a Superstructure is exceeding firm, being fast, and close joyned to a sure foundation, which, yet no man will grant, is fundamental. Besides, whatsoever is fundamental in the Faith, is fundamental to the Church, which is one by the unity ^g of Faith. Therefore if every thing defined by the Church

f Nay if your own Capillus be true, De Appell. Eccl. Afric. c. 2. n. 9: it was but a Provincial of Numidia, not a Plenary of Africk.

g Almain. in 3. Stat. Dij. 25. q. 1. A Fide enim una Ecclesia dictatur una.

c L. 2. de Author. Concil. c. 9

S. A folis particularibus.

d C. 1. & 4.

e Concil. Afric. viti. Cap. 2.

f Nay if your own Capillus be true, De Appell. Eccl.

Afric. c. 2. n. 9:

it was but a

Provincial of

Numidia,

not a Plenary

of Africk.

Church be fundamental in the Faith ; then the Churches Definition is the Churches foundation. And so upon the matter, the Church can lay her own foundation ; and then, the Church must be in absolute and perfect Being, before so much as her foundation is laid. Now this is so absurd for any man of Learning to say, that by and by after A. C. is content to affirm, not only, that the prima Credibilia, the Articles of Faith, but all which so pertains to Supernatural, Divine, and Infallible Christian Faith, as that thereby Christ doth dwell in our hearts, &c. is the foundation of the Church under Christ the Prime Foundation. And here he's out again. For first, all which

* Aliquid persinet ad Fidem duplicitate. ut modo directe, sicut ea que nobis sunt principali et divinitatis tradita, ut Deum esse Trinum, &c. Et tertia haec opinari falsum hoc ipsa inducit Heres, &c. Alio modo indirecte. Ex quibus conatur aliquid contrarium Fidei, &c. Et in his aliquis potest falsum opinari abque periculo Heretis, donec Sequela illa si intotefcat, &c. Tho. p. 1. q. 32. A. 4. c. There are things necessary to the Faith ; and things which are but accessory, &c. Hooker L. 3. Ecl. Pol. §. 3.

the Jesuite, and his Defender A. C. If all Points made firm by full Authority of the Church be fundamental, then they must grant, that every thing determined by the Council of Trent is fundamental in the Faith. For with them 'tis firm and Catholike, which that Council Decrees. Now

† Si quis Dixerit Ordines ab Episcopis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consentia aut vocatio irritos esse; Anathema sit. Con. Trident. Sess. 23. Can. 7.

that Council Decrees, † That Orders collated by the Bishop are not void, though they be given without the consent or calling of the People, or of any Secular Power. And yet they can produce no Author that ever acknowledged this Definition of the Council fundamental in the Faith. 'Tis true, I do not grant, that the Decrees of this Council are made by full Authority of the Church ; but they do both grant and maintain it : And therefore 'tis Argumentum ad hominem, a good argument against them, that a thing so defined may be firm, for so this is ; and yet not fundamental, for so this is not.

NUM. 15. But A. C. tells us further, That if one may deny, or doubtfully dispute against any one Determination of the Church, then he may against another, and another, and so against all ; since all are made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation, sufficiently applied by one and the same full Authority of the Church ; which being weakened in any one, cannot be firm in any other. First, A. C. might have acknowledged that he borrowed

rowed the former part of this out of * *Vincentius Lirinensis*. And as that Learned Father uses it, I subscribe to it, but not as A.C. applies it. For *Vincentius* speaks there *de Catholico Dogmate*, of Catholick Maximes:

and A.C. will force it to every Determination of the Church.

Now *Catholike Maximes*, which are properly *fundamental*, are \$38. N.21.

certain *prime truths* deposited with the Church, and not so much determined by the Church, as published and manifested,

and so made firm by her to us. For so † *Vincentius* expressly. Where, all that the Church doth, is but, *ut hoc idem quod ante*, that the same thing may be believed, which was before believed, but with more light, and clearness, and (in that sense) with more firmness, then before.

Now in this sense, give way to a *Disputator errans*, every Cavilling Disputer to deny, or quarrel at the Maximes of Christian Religion, any one, or any part of any one of them; and why may he not then take liberty to do the like of any other, till he have shaken all? But this hinders not the *Church her self*, nor any appointed by the Church to examine her own *Decrees*, and to see that she keep *Dogmata deposita*, the Principles of Faith unblemished, and uncorrupted. For if she do not so, but that * *No-vitia veteribus*, new Doctrines be added to the old; the Church, which is *Sacrum veritatis*, the *Repository of Verity*, may be changed *in lupanar errorum*, I am loath to English it. By the Church then this may, nay it ought to be done, however, every wrangling *Disputator* may neither deny, nor doubtfully dispute, much less obstinately oppose the Determinations of the Church, no not where they are not *Dogmata Depositum*, these deposited Principles. But if he will be so bold to deny or dispute the Determinations of the Church; yet that may be done without shaking the *foundation*, where the Determinations themselves belong but to the *fabrick*, and not to the *founda-tion*. For a whole *frame of Building* may be shaken, and yet the *foundation* where it is well laid, remain firm. And therefore after all, A.C. dares not say, the *foundation is shaken*, but *a sort*. And then 'tis as true, that *in a sort* it is not shaken.

2 For the second part of his Argument, A.C. must pardon N U M. 16. me, if I dissent from him. For first, All Determinations of the Church are not made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation. For some Determinations of the Church are made firm to us, *per chirographum + Scripture*, by the hand-writing of the Scripture; and that's Authentical indeed. Some

* *Cont. Herv. c. 31. Abdicata min-
qualiter parte Catholici Dogmatis, a-
lia quoque atque item alia, &c. Quid
aliud ad extreum sequatur, nisi ut totum
pariter repudietur?*

† *Ecclesia Depositorum apud se Dogmatum
Custos, &c. Denique quid unquam Conciliorum
Decretis enixa est, nisi, ut quod ante
tea simpliciter credebatur, hoc idem postea
diligenter credere, &c. Vin. Lir. cont.
Herv. c. 32.*

* *Vin. Lir. cont. Herv. c. 31. Impiorum
& turpium Errorum Lupanar: ubi erat
etiam causa & corruptio Sacrum p-
ritatis.*

other Decisions, yea and of the Church too, are made, or may

[†] Ratiō. cont. 4. q. 1. Art. 3. Etiam
nullo Scripturarum, aut evidenti, aut pro-
babili Testimoniō, &c.

^{*} Non potest aliquid certum esse certi-
dine fidei, nisi aut immediā continetur
in Verbo Dei, aut ex Verbo Dei per evi-
dētēm consequentiam deducatur. Bellar.
L. 3. de Iustificat. c. 8. §. Prima Ratio.

be (if [†] Stapleton inform us right) without an evident, nay without so much as a probable Testimony of Holy Writ. But ^{*} Bellarmine falls quite off in this, and confesses in express terms, *That nothing can be certain by certainty of Faith, unless it be contained immediately in the Word of God;*

or be deduced out of the Word of God by evident consequence.

And if nothing can be certain but so, then certainly no *Determination of the Church it self*, if that Determination be not grounded upon one of these: either express Word of God, or evident consequence out of it. So here's little agreement in this great Point between Stapleton and Bellarmine. Nor can this be shifted off, as if Stapleton spake of the *Word of God Written*, and Bellarmine of the *Word of God Unwritten* (as he calls *Tradition*.) For Bellarmine treats there of the knowledge which a man hath of the certainty of his own Salvation. And I hope A. C. will not tell us, there's any *Tradition extant unwritten*, by which *particular men* may have assurance of their several Salvations. Therefore Bellarmine's whole Disputation there is quite beside the matter: or else he must speak of the *written Word*, and so lye cross to Stapleton, as is mentioned. But to return. If A. C. will, he may, but I cannot believe, that a *Definition of the Church*, which is made by the express *Word of God*, and another which is made without so much as a *probable Testimony of it*, or a *clear Deduction from it*, are made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation. Nay, I must say in this case, that the one Determination is firm by Divine Revelation, but the other hath *no Divine Revelation at all*, but the *Churches Authority only*.

Secondly, I cannot believe neither, *That all Determinations of the Church are sufficiently applied by one and the same full Authority of the Church.* For the Authority of the Church, though it be of the same fulnes in regard of it self, and of the Power which it commits to *General Councils lawfully called*: yet it is not always of the same fulnes of knowledge and sufficiency; nor of the same fulnes of Conscience, and integrity to apply *Dogmatica Fides*, that which is Dogmatical in the Faith. For instance, I think you dare not deny but the *Council of Trent* was lawfully called; and yet I am of Opinion, that few, even of your selves, believe that the *Council of Trent* hath the same fulnes with the *Council of Nice*, in all the forenamed kinds, or degrees of fulnes. Thirdly, suppose that all *Determinations of the Church are made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation*, and *sufficiently applied by one and the same full Authority*; yet it will not follow, that they are all

all alike fundamental in the Faith. For I hope A. C. himself will not say, that the Definitions of the Church are in better condition, than the Propositions of Canonical Scripture. Now all Propositions of Canonical Scripture are alike firm, because they all alike proceed from Divine Revelation: but they are not all alike fundamental in the Faith. For this Proposition of Christ to S. Peter and S. Andrew, *Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men*^{*}, is as firm a truth, as that which he delivered to his Disciples, *That he must die, and rise again the third day*[†]: For both proceed from the same Divine Revelation, out of the mouth of our Saviour; and both are sufficiently applied by one and the same full Authority of the Church, which receives the whole Gospel of S. Matthew to be Canonical and Infallible Scripture. And yet both these Propositions of Christ are not alike fundamental in the Faith. For I dare say, No man shall be saved (in the ordinary way of Salvation) that believes not the Death and the Resurrection of Christ. And I believe A. C. dares not say, that no man shall be saved, into whose capacity it never came, that Christ made S. Peter and Andrew fishers of men. And yet should he say it, nay should he shew it *sub annulo Piscatoris*, no man will believe it, that hath not made shipwreck of his common Notions. Now if it be thus between Proposition and Proposition issuing out of Christ's own Mouth; I hope it may well be so also between even Just and True Determinations of the Church, that supposing them alike true and firm, yet they shall not be alike fundamental to all mens belief.

F. Secondly, I required to know, what Points the Bishop would account Fundamental. He said, all the Points of the Creed were such.

B. Against this I hope you except not. For since the ^a F.x. ^b since the agreeing ^c Tertull. ^d Bonavent. ^e Thom. 2. 2. 1. ^f S. August. ^g S. Amb. cap. 2. ^h Ruffio. ⁱ Symb. apud ^j Cyprian. p. 357. ^k Alb. Mag. in 1. Sint. D. 11. A. 7. ^l c concil. Trident. Sess. 3. others make the Creed the Rule of Faith; since the agreeing NUM. 1. sense of scripture with those Articles are the two Regular Precepts by which a Divine is governed about the Faith; since your own Council of Trent Decrees, That it is that Principle of Faith, in which all that profess Christ, do necessarily agree, & fundatum firmum & unicum, not the firm alone, but the only foundation; since it is Excommunication ^d ipso jure, for any man to contradict the Articles contained in that Creed; since the whole Body of the Faith is so contained in the Creed, as that the substance of it was believ'd even before the coming of Christ, though not so expressly as since in the number of q. 1. Art. 1. ^e Thom. 2. 2. 1. ^f Art. 7. ^g 3. in lituram.

f Bellar. L.4
de Verb. Dei
nos Script. c.
11. S. Pri-
mum est.

g Tho.2.20.
q. 1. A.7.c.

h 1. S. Joh 4.2
i Heb. 11. 6.

N U M. 2.
A.C. p.40.

* Conc. Trident.
Sess. 3.

† In 1. Sent.
D. 11. A.7:
Regula Fidei
est concors
Scripturarum
Iesu cum Ar-
ticulis Fidei :
Quia illis duo
bus regulari-
bus Preceptis
regularibus
regularibus

the *Articles*; since ^f Bellarmine confesses, That all things simply necessary for all mens Salvation are in the *Creed*, and the *Decalogue*; what reason can you have to except? And yet for all this, every thing fundamental is not of a like nearness to the foundation, nor of equal primeness in the Faith. And my granting the *Creed* to be fundamental, doth not deny, but that there are ^g quædam prima Credibilia, certain prime Principles of Faith, in the bosom whereof all other *Articles* lay wrapped and folded up. One of which since Christ, is that of ^h S. John: *Every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God.* And one, both before the coming of Christ, and since, is that of S. Paul: ⁱ *He that comes to God, must believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him.*

Here A. C. tells you, That either I must mean that those points are only fundamental, which are expressed in the *Creed*; or those also which are infolded. If I say, those only which are expressed, then (saith he) to believe the *Scriptures* is not fundamental, because tis not expressed. If I say, those which are infolded in the *Articles*, then some unwritten Church-Traditions may be accounted fundamental. The truth is, I said, and say still, that all the Points of the *Apostles Creed*, as they are there expressed, are fundamental. And therein I say no more, then some of your best Learned have said before me. But I never either said, or meant, that they only are fundamental; that they are ^{*} *Fundamentum unicum*, the only Foundation, is the *Council of Trent's*; tis not mine. Mine is, That the belief of *Scripture* to be the Word of God, and Infallible, is an equal, or rather a preceding Prime Principle of Faith, with, or to the whole Body of the *Creed*. And this agrees (as before I told the *Jesuite*) with one of your own great Masters, *Albertus Magnus* †, who is not far from that Proposition in terminis. So here the very foundation of A. C. Dilemma falls off. For I say not, That only the Points of the *Creed* are fundamental, whether expressed, or not expressed. That all of them are, that I say. And yet though the foundation of his Dilemma be fallen away, I will take the boldnes to tell A. C. That if I had said, that those *Articles* only which are expressed in the *Creed*, are fundamental, it would have been hard to have excluded the *Scripture*, upon which the *Creed* itself in every Point is grounded. For nothing is supposed to shut out its own foundation. And if I should now say, that some *Articles* are fundamental which are infolded in the *Creed*, it would not follow, that therefore some unwritten Traditions were fundamental. Some Traditions I deny not true and firm, and of great, both Authority, and Use in the Church, as being *Apostolical*, but yet not fundamental in the Faith. And it would be a mighty

mighty large *fold*, which should lap up *Traditions* within the *Creed*. As for that *Tradition*, That the *Books of holy Scriptures* are Divine, and Infallible in every part, I will handle that when I come to the proper place * for it.

* S. 16. N. 1.

F. I asked how then it happened (as M. Rogers saith) that the English Church is not yet resolved, what is the right sense of the Article of Christ's descending into Hell.

B. The English Church never made doubt (that I know) what was the sense of that Article. The words are so plain, they bear their meaning before them. She was content to put that + Ar. 1. among those, to which she requires *Subscription*, not as doubting of the sense, but to prevent the Cavils of some, who had been too busie in *crucifying that Article*, and in making it all one with the Article of the Cross, or but an *Exposition of it*.

And surely, for my part, I think the *Church of England* is better resolved of the right sense of this Article, than the *Church of Rome*, especially if she must be tryed by her Writers, as you try the *Church of England* by M. Rogers. For, you cannot agree, whether this Article be a meer *Tradition*, or whether it hath any place of *Scripture* to warrant it.

^a *Scotus*, and ^b *Stapleton* allow it no footing in *Scripture*, but ^c *Bellarmino* is resolute, that this Article is every where in *Scripture*; and ^d *Thomas* grants as much for the whole *Creed*. The *Church of England* never doubted it, and ^e *S. Augustine* proves it.

And yet again, you are different for the sense. For you agree not, Whether the Soul of Christ, *in triduo mortis*, in the time of his Death, did go down into Hell *really*, and was present there; or *virtually*, and by effects only. For ^f *Thomas* holds the first, and ^g *Durand* the later. Then you agree not, Whether the Soul of Christ did descend *really* and in *essence* into the lowest Pit of Hell, and place of the Damited, as ^h *Bellarmino* once held probable, and proved it; or *really* only into that place, or *Region* of Hell, which you call *Limbum Patrum*; and then, but *virtually* from thence into the *Lower Hell*: to which ⁱ *Bellarmino* reduces himself, and gives his reason, because it is the ^k common *Opinion* of the School. Now the *Church of England* takes the words as they are in the *Creed*, and believes them without farther Dispute, and in that sense which the *ancient Primitive Fathers* of the Church agreed in. And yet if any in the *Church of England* should not be throughly resolved in the sense of this Article; Is it not as lawful for them to say [*I conceive thus, or thus of it; yet if any other way of his Descent*

a *Scotus in 1. D. 11. q. 1.*b *Stapleton Relig. Conf. 5. q. 5. Art. 1.*c *Bellar. 4. de Christo. c. 6. & 12. Scriptura pafsim hoc docent.*d *Thom. 2. 2e. q. 1. A. 9. ad 1.*e *S. Aug. Ep. 99.*

NUM. 3.

f *Tho. p. 3. q.*

g 2. A. 2. c. per

*summissionem.*g *Durand. in*

3. d. 22. q. 2. 3.

h *Bellar. L. 4.**de Christo. c. 16*i *Bellar. Recog.*

j 11.

k *Sequitur**enim. Tho. p. 3.*

l 52. A. 2.

* Non est per-
tinaciter asse-
rendum, quia
Anima Christi

per alium modum nobis ignorantem poturum descendere ad Infernum : Nec nos negamus alium modum esse forsan ve-
riorum ; sed fatetur nos illum ignorare. Durand. in 3. Sent. Diss. 22. q. 3. Nu. 9.

F. The Bishop said, That M. Rogers was but a private man.
But (said I) if M. Rogers (writing as he did by pub-
like Authority) be accounted onely a private man, &c.

§. 13. B. I said truth, when I said M. Rogers was a private man.
NUM. 1. And I take it, you will not allow every speech of every man,
though allowed by Authority to have his Books Printed, to be

† And this was an Ancient fault too, for
S. Augustine checks at it in his time. Noli colligere calumnias ex Episcoporum scriptis, fratre Hilarii, fratre Cypriani &
Agrippini. Primi, quia hoc genus literarum ab Authoritate Canonis distinguendam est. Non enim sic leguntur tanquam
ita ex iis testimonio proferantur, ut contra sententiam licet, sicuti fidei alter
sentient, quoniam veritas potulat. S. Aug.
Ep. 48. &c. And yet these were far
greater men in their generations, than
M. Rogers was.

People, or cast a mist before evident Truth, lest it cause a final
descent to that place of Torment. But since you will hold this
course, Stapleton was of greater note with you, than M. Rogers
his Exposition, or Notes upon the Articles of the Church of En-
gland is with us. And as he, so his Selection. And is it the Do-
ctrine of the Church of Rome which Stapleton affirms, || The
Scripture is silent, that Christ descended into Hell, and that there
is a Catholike and an Apostolike Church ? If it be, then what
will become of the Pope's Supremacie over the whole Church ?
Shall he have his power over the Catholike Church given him
expressly in Scripture, in the * Keys, to enter; and in + Pa-
scue, to feed when he is in ; and when he had fed, to || Confirm;
and in all these, not to erre and fail in his Ministratio : And is
the Catholike Church, in and over which he is to do all these
great things, quite left out of the Scripture ? Belike the Holy
Ghost was careful to give him his power ; Yes in any case ;
but left the assigning of his great Cure, the Catholike Church,
to Tradition. And it were well for him, if he could so pre-
scribe for what he now Claims.

NUM. 2.

* Rogers in
Art. Eccles.
Angl. Art. 3.

But what if after all this, M. Rogers there says no such thing ?
As in truth, he doth not. His words are : * All Christians ac-
knowledge, He descended ; but in the interpretation of the Arti-
cle,

etc, there is not that consent, that were to be wised. What is this to the Church of England, more than others? And again, + Tis we know the native and undoubted sense of this Article, is + Ibid.
M. Rogers [We] the Church of England? or rather his, and some others Judgment, in the Church of England?

Now here A. C. will have somewhat again to say, though, God knows, tis to little purpose. Tis, that the Jesuit urged M. Roger's Book, because it was set out by Publike Authority: And because the Book bears the Title of the Catholike Doctrine of the Church of England. A. C. may undoubtedly urge M. Rogers, if he please; But he ought not to say, that his Opinion is the Doctrine of the Church of England, for neither of the Reasons by him expressed. First, not because his Book was publikely allowed. For many Books among them, as well as among us, have been Printed by publike Authority, as containing nothing in them contrary to Faith and good manners, and yet containing many things in them of Opinion only, or private Judgment, which yet is far from the avowed Positive Doctrine of the Church, the Church having as yet determined neither way by open Declaration upon the words, or things controverted. And this is more frequent among their School-men, than among any of our Controversiers, as is well known. Nor secondly, because his Book bears the Title of the Catholike Doctrine of the Church of England. For suppose the worst, and say, M. Rogers thought a little too well of his own pains, and gave his Book too high a Title; is his private Judgment therefore to be accounted the Catholike Doctrine of the Church of England? Surely no: No more than I should say, every thing said by * Thomas, or † Bonaventure, is Angelical, or Seraphical Doctrine, because one of these is stiled in the Church of Rome, Seraphical, and the other, Angelical Doctor. And yet their works are Printed by Publike Authority, and that Title given them.

Yea, but our private Authors (saith A. C.) are not allowed (for ought I know) in such a like sort to express our Catholike Doctrine in any matter subject to Question. Here are two Limitations, which will go far to bring A.C. off, whatsoever I shall say against him! For first, let me instance in any private man, that takes as much upon him as M. Rogers doth, he will say, he knew it not, his Assertion here being no other, then for ought he knows. Secondly If he be unwilling to acknowledge so much, yet he will answer, 'tis not just in such a like sort as M. Rogers doth it, that is, perhaps, it is not the very Title of his Book. But well then: Is there never a Private man allowed in the Church of Rome to express your Catholike Doctrine in any matter subject to Question? What? Not in any matter? Were not Vega and Soto two private men? Is it not a matter subject to Question, to great Question in these Days, Whether a man may be certain

* Angelici D.
S. Tho. Summa.
† Celebratissimi
Patri Dom.
Bonaventure
Doctrinis Stra-
phicti in 3. L.
Sent. Disputata.

N U M . 4.
A. C. p. 47.

* Bellar. Lib.
3. de Justif. c.
c. 1. §. 14.
† Huic Contra-
lio Catholice
omnes ingena-
sua, & iudicia
sponte subveni-
unt. Bellar. L.
3. de Justif. c.
c. 3. §. Sed
Concilii Tri-
denini.
|| Hilt. Council.
Tident. Lib. 2.
p. 245. Edit.
Lat. Lxide,
1622.

A.C. p. 47.

* Bellar. L. 3.
de Justif. c. 3.

certain of his being in the state of Salvation, *certitudine fidei*, by the certainty of Faith ? Doth not * *Bellarmino* make it a Controversie ? And is it not a part of your *Catholike Faith*, if it be determined in the † *Council of Trent* ? And yet these two great *Fryers* of their time, *Dominicus Soto*, and *Andreas Vega* || were of contrary Opinions ; and both of them challenged the Decree of the Council ; and so consequently your *Catholike Faith* to be as each of them concluded : and both of them wrote Books to maintain their Opinions ; and both of their Books were published by Authority. And therefore I think 'tis allowed in the *Church of Rome* to private men to express your *Catholike Doctrine*, and in a matter subject to Question. And therefore also, if another man in the *Church of England*, should be of a contrary Opinion to M. *Rogers*, and declare it under the Title of the *Catholike Doctrine of the Church of England*, this were no more than *Soto* and *Vega* did in the *Church of Rome*. And I, for my part, cannot but wonder A.C. should not know it. For he says, that for ought he knows, private men are not allowed so to express their *Catholike Doctrine*. And in the same Question both *Catharinus* and *Bellarmino* * take on them, to express your *Catholike Faith*, the one differing from the other, almost as much as *Soto* and *Vega*, and perhaps in some respect more.

F. But if M. Rogers be only a private man ; in what Book may we find the *Protestants* publike *Doctrine* ? The Bishop answered, That to the *Book of Articles* they were all sworn.

§. 14.
NUM. 1.

A.C. p. 47.

B. What ? Was I so ignorant to say, *The Articles of the Church of England were the Publike Doctrine of all the Protestants* ? Or, that all the *Protestants* were sworn to the *Articles of England*, as this speech seems to imply ? Sure I was not. Was not the immediate speech before of the *Church of England* ? And how comes the Subject of the Speech to be varied in the next lines ? Nor yet speak I this, as if other *Protestants* did not agree with the *Church of England* in the chiefest *Doctrines*, and in the main Exceptions, which they jointly take against the *Roman Church*, as appears by their several *Confessions*. But if A.C. will say (as he doth) that because there was speech before of the *Church of England*, the Jesuite understood me in a limited sense, and meant only the *Protestants* of the *English Church* ; Be it so ; there's no great harm done † but this, that the Jesuite offers to inclose me too much. For I did not say, that the *Book of Articles* only was the Continent of the *Church of Englands* publike *Doctrine* : She is not so narrow, nor hath she purpose to exclude any thing which she acknowledges hers, nor doth she wit-

† And therefore A.C. needs not make such a Noise about it, as he doth, page 48.

wittingly permit any Crossing of her publike Declarations ; yet she is not such a *Shrew* to her Children, as to deny her *Blessing*, or Denounce an *Anathema* against them, if some peaceably dissent in some Particulars remoter from the *Foundation*, as your own *School-men* differ. And if the *Church of Rome*, since she grew to her greatness, had not been so fierce in this Course, and too particular in Determining too many things, and making them matters of *Necessary Belief*, which had gone for many hundreds of years before, only for things of *Pious Opinion* ; *Christendom* (I perswade my self) had been in happier peace at this Day , than (I doubt) we shall ever live to see it.

Well, But *A.C.* will prove the *Church of England* a *Shrew*, and such a *Shrew*. For in her Book * of *Canons* She excommunicates every man, who shall hold any thing contrary to any part of the said Articles. So *A.C.* But surely these are not the *very words* of the *Canon*, nor perhaps the *sense*. Not the *Words*; for they are : *Whoever shall affirm that the Articles are in any part superstitious, or erroneous, &c.* And perhaps not the *sense*. For it is one thing for a man to hold an *Opinion* privately within himself ; and another thing boldly and publiquely to affirm it. And again, 'tis one thing to hold contrary to some part of an *Article*, which perhaps may be but in the manner of Expression ; and another thing positively to affirm, that the Articles in any part of them are *superstitious*, and *erroneous*. But this is not the Main of the Business : For though the *Church of England* Denounce *Excommunication*, as is + before expref-
sed ; Yet she comes far short of the *Church of Rome's* severity, whose *Anathema's* are not only for 39 Articles, but for very many more, * above one hundred in matters of *Doctrine* ; and that in many Poynts as far remote from the *Foundation*, though to the far greater Rack of mens Consciences, they must be all made *Fundamental*, if that *Church have once Determined them* : whereas the *Church of England* never declared, That every one of her *Articles* are *Fundamental in the Faith*: For 'tis one thing to say, No one of them is *superstitious* or *erroneous* : And quite another to say, Every one of them is *fundamental*, and that in every part of it, to *all mens Belief*. Besides, the *Church of England* prescribes only to her own Children; and by those *Articles* provides but for her own peaceable Consent in those Doctrines of Truth. But the *Church of Rome* severely imposes her *Doctrine* upon the *whole World* under pain of *Damnation*.
Eccles. 4. This is a very natural and
true. And that the *Scriptures only, not any unwritten Tradition, was the Foundation of their Faith*.

NUM. 2.
A.C. p.48.
** can. 5.*

* *concl. Tri-*
den.

A.C.p.45:

§. 15.
NUM. 1.

B. The Church of England grounded her Positive Articles upon Scripture; and her Negative do refute there, where, the thing affirmed by you, is not affirmed by Scripture, nor directly to be concluded out of it. And here not the Church of England only, but all Protestants, agree most truly, and most strongly in this, *That the Scripture is sufficient to salvation, and contains in it all things necessary to it.* The Fathers * are plain, the School-men not strangers in it. And have not we reason then to account it, as it is, *The Foundation of our Faith?* And || Stapleton himself, though an angry Opposite, confesses, *That the Scripture is in some sort the Foundation of Faith, that is, in the nature of Testimony, and in the matter, or thing to be believed.* And if the Scripture be the Foundation, to which we are to go for witness, if there be Doubt about the Faith, and in which we are to find the thing that is to be believed, as necessary in the Faith; we never did, nor never will refuse any Tradition that is Universal, and Apostolike, for the better Exposition of the Scripture; nor any Definition of the Church, in which she goes to the Scripture, for what she teaches; and thrusts nothing as Fundamental in the Faith upon the world, but what the Scripture fundamentally makes *materiam Credendorum*, the substance of that which is so to be believed, whether immediately and expressly in words, or more remotely, where a clear and full Deduction draws it out.

* S. Basil. de vir. & pia fide. Manifessa definitio Fidei est importare quicquam tamquam rem que scripta non sunt. S. Hilar. l. 2. ad Conf. Ang. Fidem tantum iocundatio ea que scripta sunt desiderantur, & hoc qui repudiat, Antichristus est, & qui simulat, Anathema est. S. Aug. l. 2. de Doctr. Christian. c. 9. In iis quoque operis in Scriptura posita sunt, invenerunt illa omnia que continent fidem, portaque vivendi. And to this place Bellarm. l. 4. de virbo Dei usq; scripti, cap. 11. faith, that S. Augustinus speaks *de illa Demonstratio que necessaria sunt omnibus simplicitate*, of those Points of Faith, which are necessary simply for all men. So far then he grants the Question. And that you may know, it fell not from him on the sudden, he had said as much before, in the beginning of the same Chapter, and here he confirms it again.

† Scotus Prolog. in sent. q. 2. *Scriptura sufficiens continet Doctrinam necessariam Viatori.* Thom. 2.2. q. 1. a. 10. ad 1. In Doctrina Christi & Apostolorum, veritas fidei est sufficienter explicata. And he speaks there of the written Word.

|| *Scripturam Fundamentum est. Ur Columnam Fidei summo in suo genere, i. e. in genere Testimoniorum, & in materia Credendorum.* Bellarm. Cap. 4. q. 1. art. 3. in fine.

NUM. 2.
A.C. 9-48.

Against the beginning of this Paragraph A.C. excepts. And first he says, *Tis true, that the Church of England grounded her Positive Articles upon Scripture: That is, 'tis true, if themselves may be competent Judges in their own Cause.* But this by the leave of A.C. is true, without making our selves Judges in our own Cause. For, *that all the Positive Articles of the present Church of England are grounded upon Scripture*, we are content to be judged by the joyns and constant Belief of the Fathers, which lived within the first four or five hundred years after Christ, when the Church was at the best; and by the Councils held within those times; and to submit to them in all those Points of Doctrine. Therefore we desire not to be Judges in our own Cause. And if any whom A.C. calls a Novellist, can truly say, and

and maintain this, he will quickly prove himself no *Novellist*. And for the *Negative Articles*, they refute, where the thing affirmed by you, is either not affirmed in Scripture, or not directly to be concluded out of it. Upon this *Negative ground* A. C. infers again, *That the Baptism of Infants is not expressly (at least not evidently) affirmed in Scripture, nor directly (at least not demonstratively) concluded out of it*. In which case he professes he would gladly know, what can be answered to defend this doctrine to be a Point of Faith necessary for the salvation of Infants. And in Conclusion, professes, he cannot easily guess what answer can be made, unless we will acknowledge Authority of Church-Tradition necessary in this Case.

And truly since A. C. is so desirous of an Answer, I will give it freely. And first in the General. I am no way satisfied with A. C. his *Addition* (*not expressly, at least not evidently*) what means he? If he speak of the *Letter* of the Scripture, then, whatsoever is *expressly*, is *evidently* in the Scripture, and so his *Addition* is vain. If he speak of the *Meaning* of the Scripture, then his *Addition* is cunning. For many things are *Expressly* in Scripture, which yet in their *Meaning* are not *evidently* there. And what e're he mean, my words are, *That our Negative Articles refute that which is not affirmed in Scripture*, without any *Addition of Expressy, or Evidently*. And he should have taken my words, as I used them. I like nor *Change*, nor *Addition*, nor am I bound to either of A. C.'s making. And I am as little satisfied with his next *Addition* (*nor directly, at least not demonstratively concluded out of it*). For are there not many things in *Good Logick* concluded, *directly*, which yet are not concluded *Demonstratively*? Surely there are. For to be directly or indirectly concluded, flows from the *Mood or Form of the Syllogism*: To be demonstratively concluded, flows from the *Matter or Nature of the Propositions*. If the Propositions be Prime and necessary Truths, the *Syllogism* is *demonstrative and scientific*, because the *Propositions* are such. If the *Propositions* be probable only, though the *Syllogism* be made in the clearest Mood, yet is the *Conclusion* no more. The *Inference*, or *Consequence* indeed is clear and necessary, but the *Consequent* is but probable, or topical, as the *Propositions* were. Now my words were only for a *Direct Conclusion*, and no more: though in this case I might give A. C. his Caution. For *Scripture* here is the thing spoken of. And *Scripture* being a *Principle*, and every *Text of Scripture* confessedly a *Principle* among all Christians, whereof no man * *desires* any farther proof: I would fain know, why that which is plainly and apparently, that is, by direct *Consequence*, proved out of *Scripture*, is not *Demonstratively* or *Scientifically* proved? If at least he think

* *Habitus enim Fidei iste habeat in ordinis ad Theologiam, sicut si habeat Habitus intellectus ad Scientias humanas. M. Cato. L. 2. de L. c. 8.*

there can be any *Demonstration in Divinity*: and if there can be none, why did he add *Demonstratively*?

NUM. 4.
A.C. p. 49.

Next in particular; I answer to the Instance which A.C. makes, concerning the *Baptism of Infants*. That it may be concluded directly (and let A.C. judge, whether not demonstratively) out of Scripture, both that *Infants* ought to be baptised, and that *Baptism* is necessary to their *Salvation*. And first, that *Baptism is necessary to the Salvation of Infants* (in the ordinary way of the

Church, without binding God to the use and means of that *Sacrament*, to which he hath bound us) + is express in S. John 3. *Except a man be born again of water, and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* So, no *Baptism*, no *Entrance*. Nor can *Infants* creep in any other ordinary way. And this is the received Opinion of all the *Ancient Church of Christ*. And secondly, *That Infants ought to be baptised*, is first plain by *Evident and Direct Consequence* out of Scripture. For if there be no *Salvation* for *Infants* in the ordinary way of the Church, but by *Baptism*, and this appear in Scripture, as it doth; then out of all Doubt, the Consequence is most evident out of that Scripture, *That Infants are to be baptised*, that their *Salvation* may be certain. For they which cannot + help themselves, must not be left only to *Extraordinary Helps*, of which we have no assurance, and for which we have no warrant at all in Scripture, while we in the mean time neglect the ordinary way and means commanded by Christ. Secondly, tis very near an Expression in Scripture it self. For when * S. Peter had ended that great Sermon of his, Act. 2. he applies two comforts unto them, Verse 38. *Amend your lives, and be baptised, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* And then, Verse 39, he infers, *For the promise is made*

+ S. Aug. exprest of the *Baptism of Infants*. L. 1. de Peccato. Mtr. &c. R. miss. c. 30 Et L. 2. c. 27. Et L. 3. de Animâ & ejus Origine. c. 13. Nay they of the Romane Party which urge the *Baptism of Infants* as a matter of Faith, and yet not to be concluded out of Scripture; when they are not in anger purlit of this Controversie, but look upon truth with a more indifferent eye, confess as much (even that Leamus of them) as we ask. *Adventum autem Salvatoris annuntiat [Nisi quis renatus, &c.] ne quis sit baptizatus, ac praeceps Partulus derelictus est aquâ & Spiritu. Jamen. Hanc. in Evangel. c. 20. So here. Baptism Necessary for Infants, and that Necessity imposed by our Saviour, and not by the Church only. Heretiq. nunc adi. quoniam hoc Scriptura testimonio probatur passum. Infantes esse baptizandos. Mald. in S. Joh. 3. 5. So Maldonat confesses that the Hereticks (we know whom he means) can prove the *Baptism of Infants* by no Testimony of Scripture but this: which speech implies, That by this Testimony of Scripture it is, and can be proved, and therefore not by Church-Tradition only. And I would fain know, why Bellarmine, L. 1. de Baptism. cap. 8. §. 5. should bring three Arguments out of Scripture to prove the *Baptism of Infants* [*Habemus in Scriptura tria Argumenta, &c.*] if *Baptism* cannot be proved at all out of Scripture, but only by the Tradition of the Church, and yet, this is not Bellarmine's way alone, but Suarez's in Tho. p. 3. q. 68. Disp. 25. Sect. 1. §. 2. Et Scriptura postulat varia Argumenta sumi ad confirmandum Pedobaptismum. Et similiter, &c. And Greg. de Valentia, L. 1. de Bapt. Parag. lorum, c. 2. S. 1. And the Pope himself, Innocent. 3. L. 3. *Discretal.* Mf. 42. C. 29. Majores. And they all jump with S. Amb. L. 10. Ep. 84. *Hab. dicitur. Et S. Chrysost. Hom. de Adam & Eva. Hoc prædictat Ecclesia Catholica ab aliis diffidit.* + regi varijs orationis qui pro se loquuntur possum, &c. S. Aug. Scrm. 8. de verb. Apoll. c. 8.*

* Infantes reos esse Originalis peccati, & ideo bapticandos esse. Antiqui Fidei Regule docuit. S. Aug. Scrm. 8. de verb. Apoll. c. 8. Et semper vobis (yurris doctrinae alianas, hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit, hinc a majorum fiducia recipit, &c. S. Aug. Scrm. 10. de verb. Apoll. c. 8. + S. Ambro. L. 10. Ep. 84. *Hab. dicitur. Et S. Chrysost. Hom. de Adam & Eva. Hoc prædictat Ecclesia Catholica ab aliis diffidit.* + regi varijs orationis qui pro se loquuntur possum, &c. S. Aug. Scrm. 8. de verb. Apoll. c. 8.

* Act. 2. 38, 39.

to you, and to your children. The Promise ; What Promise ? What ? Why the Promise of *Sanctification* by the *Holy Ghost*. By what means ? Why, by Baptism. For 'tis expressly, Be baptized, and ye shall receive. And as expressly, This promise is made to you, and to your children. And therefore A.C. may finde it, if he will, That the Baptism of Infants may be directly concluded out of Scripture. For some of his own Party, * *Ferus* and † *Salmeron*, could both find it there. And so (if it will do him any pleasure) he hath my Answer, which he saith, he would be glad to know.

* Nullum excepit, non Jacobum, non Gentilem, non Adulatum, non Puerum, &c.
Ferus in Act.

2.39.

† Et ad Filios vestros : quare debent consentire, quum ad usum rationis pervenient, ad implenda promissa in Baptismo. &c. Salm. 118. 14. upon the place.

num 118. 14. upon the place.

Tis true, * *Bellarmino* presses a main place out of S. *Augustine's* words are, *The Custom of our Mother the Church in Baptizing Infants, is by no means to be contemned, or thought superstitious, nor yet at all to be believed, unless it were an Apostolical Tradition*. The place is truly cited, but seems a great deal stronger, than indeed it is. For first, tis not denied, That this is an *Apostolical Tradition*, and therefore to be believed, But secondly, not therefore only. Nor doth S. *Augustine* say so, nor doth *Bellarmino* press it that way. The truth is, it would have been somewhat difficult to find the Collection out of Scripture only for the *Baptism of Infants*, since they do not actually believe. And therefore S. *Augustine* is at *nec credenda nisi*, that this *Custom* of the Church had not been to be believed, had it not been an *Apostolical Tradition*. But the *Tradition* being *Apostolical*, led on the *Church* easily to see the necessary Deduction out of *Scripture*. And this is not the least use of *Tradition*, to lead the *Church* into the true meaning of those things which are found in *Scripture*, though not obvious to every eye there. And that this is S. *Augustine's* meaning, is manifest by himself, who best knew it. For when he had said, * as he doth, That to baptize children, is *Antiqua fidei Regula*, the Ancient Rule of Faith, and the constant Tenet of the Church, yet he doubts not to collect and deduce it out of *Scripture* also. For when *Pela-*

* Bellar. L. 4. de Verbo Domini. c. 9. S. 5.
† S. Aug. Gen. ad litteras. c. 23. Convenit de Mater Ecclesie in Baptizandis parvulis nequam spernenda est, nec omnia credenda, nisi Apostolica esset Traditione.

Quid ergo quod dicitur, nisi ut non accedant ad Iesum ? Sed tibi clamat Iesus, Sine Parvulus venire ad me. S. Aug. in the fore-cited places.

Pela-

* Cuius Antiquam fidei Regulam frangere conatur ? S. Aug. Ser. 8. de ver. Apob. c. 8. Hoc Eccllesia semper tenuit. Ib. Ser. 10. c. 2.

† Quid necepsarium habuit Infans Christianus, si non erogat ? S. Matth. 9. 12.

Pelagius, ut non accedant ad Jesum? That Infants may not come to their Saviour? *Sed clamat Jesus,* but Jesus cries out, *Suffer*

* S. Marc. 10.
14. + Nullus est
Scriptor tam
vetus, qui
non ejus Ori-
ginem ad Apo-
stolicum sacra-
rum procerum
referat. Calv.
4. Inf. c. 16.
S. 8.

¶ *Infirmitatem ayslum fert, si pro Defensione Pedobaptismi ad nadam Ecclesia autoritatem fugere cogernerur.*
Cal. 4. Inf. c. 8. §. 16.

The following note is written on the margin of the page:

N. U. M. 6. *
* S. 15. Num. 1.
A. C. p. 49.

+ Orig. 16.
Rom. 6. 5. Jam.
24. 343. Pro
hoc Eccliesia ab
apostolicis Tra-
ditionibus infec-
pit, etiam pat-
ulus Baptis-
tum datur. Et
S. Aug. Ser.
20. de verb.
Apost. c. 2.
Hoc Eccliesia a
Majorum fidei praecepit. And it is to be observed, that neither of these Fathers (nor I believe any other) say that the Church received it à Traditione soli, or à Majorum fidei soli: as if Tradition did exclude collection of it out of Scripture.

¶ Yea, and Ælfric himself avers, *Onnis Traditionis, &c. contineri in Scripturam in universalis. Lib. 4.* de verb. *Dei nos scripto. c. 10. S. Sic etiam. And S. Basili. Serm. de fidei approves only those Agrapha, que
non sunt alia à pia secundum Scripturam Sententia.*

As for Tradition, * I have said enough for that, and as much as A. C. where 'tis truly Apostolical. And yet if any thing will please him, I will add this concerning this particular, *The Bap-*
tizing of Infants; That the Church received this by + Tradition
from the Apostles. By Tradition. And what then? May it not directly be concluded out of Scripture, because it was delivered to the Church by way of Tradition? I hope A. C. will never say so. For certainly in Doctrinal things, nothing so likely to be a Tradition Apostolical, as that which hath a || root and a Foundation in Scripture. For Apostles cannot write, or deliver contrary, but subordinate, and subservient things.

Hoc Eccliesia a
Majorum fidei praecepit. And it is to be observed, that neither of these Fathers (nor I believe any other) say that the Church received it à Traditione soli, or à Majorum fidei soli: as if Tradition did exclude collection of it out of Scripture.

¶ Yea, and Ælfric himself avers, *Onnis Traditionis, &c. contineri in Scripturam in universalis. Lib. 4.* de verb. *Dei nos scripto. c. 10. S. Sic etiam. And S. Basili. Serm. de fidei approves only those Agrapha, que
non sunt alia à pia secundum Scripturam Sententia.*

F. I asked how he knew Scripture to be Scripture, and in particular, Genesis, Exodus, &c. These are believed to be Scripture, yet not proved out of any Place of Scripture. The Bishop said, That the Books of Scripture are Principles to be supposed, and needed not to be proved.

§. 16. B. I did never love too curious a search into that which might put a man into a wheel, and circle him so long between proving Scripture by Tradition, and Tradition by Scripture, till the Devil find a means to dispute him into Infidelity, and make him believe neither. I hope this is no part of your meaning. Yet I doubt this * Question,

* Quia certior fides deferrere sub specie
Quæcunque difficultate, est forte indigentio-
bus, Et. Orig. Q. 35. in S. Matth.

How do you know Scripture to be Scripture? hath done more harm, than you will be ever able to help by Tradition. But I must follow that way which you draw me. And because it is so much

much insisted upon by you, and is in it self a *matter of such Consequence, I will sift it a little farther.

fallible in every part, is a Foundation so necessary, as if it be doubtfully question'd, all the Faith built upon Scripture falls to the ground. A. c. p. 47. *Necesse est nosse extare libros aliquos verè Divinos. Bellarm. L. 4. de verb. Dei non scripto. c. 4. §. Quarto necesse. Et etiam libros qui sunt in manibus eis illos. Ibid. S. Sexto oportet.*

Many men labouring to settle *this great Principle* in Divinity, N U M. 2. have used divers means to prove it. All have not gone the same way, nor all the right way. You cannot be right, that resolve *Faith of the Scriptures* being the *Word of God*, into *only Tradition*. For *only*, and *no other proof*, are equal. To prove the Scripture therefore (so called by way of Excellence) to be the *Word of God*, there are several Offers at divers proofs. For first, some fly to the *Testimony* and witness of the *Church*, and her *Tradition*, which constantly believes, and unanimously delivers it. Secondly, some to the *Light and the Testimony* which the *Scripture* gives to it self ; with other internal proofs which are observed in it, and to be found in no other Writing whatsoever. Thirdly, some to the *Testimony of the Holy Ghost*, which clears up the light that is in Scripture, and seals this Faith to the Souls of men, that it is *Gods Word*. Fourthly, all that have not imbrutished themselves, and sunk below their *species*, and order of *Nature*, give even *Natural Reason* leave to come in, and make some proof, and give some approbation upon the weighing, and the consideration of other Arguments. And this must be admitted, if it be but for *Pagans* and *Infidels*, who either consider not, or value not any *one* of the other *three* : yet must some way or other be converted, or *left without excuse*. Rom. 1.20. Rom. 1. and that is done by this very evidence.

(1.)

(2.)

(3.)

(4.)

1. For the first : The *Tradition of the Church*, which is your way : That taken and considered alone, it is so far from being the *only*, that it cannot be a *sufficient Proof* to believe by *Divine Faith*, that Scripture is the *Word of God*. For that which is a *full and sufficient proof*, is able of it self to settle the Soul of man concerning it. Now the *Tradition of the Church* is not able to do this. For it may be further asked, Why we should believe the *Churches Tradition*? And if it be answered, We may believe, Because the *Church* is *infallibly governed by the Holy Ghost*; it may yet be demanded of you, How that may appear? And if this be demanded, either you must say, you have it by *special Revelation*, which is the *private spirit* you object to other men, or else you must attempt to prove it by *Scripture**, as all of you do. And that very offer, to prove it out of *Scripture*, is a sufficient acknowledgment, that the *Scripture* is a higher Proof, than the *Churches Tredi-*

tion;

* *Ritae aliquas viras Traditions demonstratus ex Scripturâ. Bellar. L.4. de verb. Dei non scripto. c.5. and A. c.p.50. proves Tradition out of 2 Thes. 2.*

tion, which (in your Grounds) is; or may be Questionable, till you come thither. Besides, this is an Inviolable ground of Reason :

* Atist. 1. Pol. c. 2. T. 16. Per Pacium.
Quocirca si dñs r̄ agn̄ta, propter pri-
ma sc̄imus & credimus, illa quoque sc̄imus
& credimus uādū magis, quia per illa
sc̄imus, & credimus etiam posteriora.

* That the Principles of any Conclusion must be of more credit, than the Conclusion it self. Therefore if the Articles of Faith, The Trinity, the Resurrection, and the rest, be the Conclusions, and the Principles by which they are proved, be only Ecclesiastical Tradition, it must needs follow, That the Tradition of the Church is more infallible than the Articles of the Faith, if the Faith which we have of the Articles should be finally Resolved into the Veracity of the Churches Testimony. But this

+ Eorum erro-
rum diffimula-
re non possum,
qui assertur

fides nostram, iā tangere in ultimam conditum causam reducendam est. Ne credamus Ecclesiam esse Persicam,
¶ C. M. Canus. L. 2. de Loci. c. 8. §. Cui, & tertium.

NUM. 4.

Again, if the Voice of the Church (saying the Books of Scripture commonly received, are the Word of God) be the formal Object of Faith, upon which alone absolutely I may resolve my self; then every man not only may, but ought to resolve his Faith into the Voice or Tradition of the Church: for every man is bound to rest upon the proper and formal Object of the Faith. But nothing can be more evident than this, That a man ought not to resolve his Faith of this Principle into the sole Testimony of the Church. Therefore neither is that Testimony, or Tradition alone, the formal Object of Faith. *

* Vox Ecclesie non est Formalis
own part grant this : Although in that Article of the Creed (I
believe the Catholike Church) peradventure all this be contain-
ed. Conf. 4. q. ed [I believe those things which the Church teacheth] yet this
is not necessarily understood, That I believe the Church teach-
ing, as an Infallible Witness. And if they did not confess this,
it were no hard thing to prove.

tur hoc totum,
Credo ea, que docet Ecclesia: tamen non intelligitur necessario, quod credo doctrii Ecclesie tanquam Teste
infallibili. Ibid. ubi etiam reicit Opinioneum. Durandi & Gabr. Et Waldens. L. 2. Dofr. Fidei Art. 2. c.
21. Num. 4. Testimonium Ecclesie Catholica est Objectum Fidei Christianae, & Legitatio Scriptura Canonica,
subjectum ipsi, sicut Testis Judicis, & Testimonium Veritatis, &c. Canus Lsc. Lib. 2. cap. 8. Nic
Ecclesia adiutum non prebet ad hujusmodi Libros Sacros cognoscendos, proutus ibi acquisendum est, sed ultra
aperte progrede, & Solida Dei veritatis nisi, &c.

NUM. 5.

But heres the cunning of this Devise. All the Authorities of Fathers, Councils, nay of Scripture too,

* Omnis ergo Ecclesiastica Authoritas, chm
fit ad Testificandam ac Christilo, & Legibus
eius: vilior est Christi legibus, & Scrip-
turis Sanctorum necessario posponenda. Wald.
L. 2. Dofr. Fidei Art. 2. cap. 21. Numb. 1.

* (though this be contrary to their own
Doctrine) must be finally Resolved into the
Authority of the present Roman Church. And
though they would seem to have us be-
lieve the Fathers, and the Church of old, yet
they will not have us take their Doctrine from their own Writ-
tings,

tings, or the Decrees of Councils : because (as they say) we cannot know by reading them, what their meaning was, but from the Infallible Testimony of the present Roman Church teaching by Tradition. Now by this, two things are evident. First, That they ascribe as great Authority (if not greater) to a part of the Catholike Church, as they do to the whole, which we believe in our Creed ; and which is the Society of all Christians. And this is full of Absurdity in Nature, in Reason, in

All things, that any * Part should be of equal worth, power, credit, or authority with the Whole. Secondly, that in their Doctrine concerning the Infallibility of their Church, their proceeding is most unreasonable. For if you ask them, Why they believe their whole Doctrine to be the sole true Catholike Faith ? Their Answer is, Because it is agreeable to the Word of God, and the Doctrine and Tradition of the Ancient Church. If you ask them, How they know that to be so ? They will then produce Testimonies of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers. But if you ask a third time, By what means they are assured, that these Testimonies do indeed make for them, and their Cause ? They will not then have recourse to Text of Scripture, or Exposition of Fathers, or Phrase and propriety of Language, in which either of them were first written, or to the scope of the Author, or the * Causes of the thing uttered, or the Conference with like † Places, or the Antecedents || and Consequents of the same Places : * or the Exposition of the dark and doubtful Places of Scripture by the undoubted and manifest. With divers other Rules given for the true knowledge and understanding of Scripture, which do frequently occur in † S. Augustin. No, none of these, or the like helps : That, with them, were to admit a Private Spirit, or to make way for it. But their final Answer is, They know it to be so, because the present Roman Church witnesseth it, according to Tradition. So arguing, a primo ad ultimum, from first to last ; the Present Church of Rome and her Followers believe her own Doctrine and Tradition to be true and Catholike, because she professes it to be such. And if this be not to prove idem per idem, the same by the same, I know not what is : which, though it be most absurd in all kind of Learning, yet out of this I see not how 'tis possible to winde them.

* Totum est maior sua parte. Etiam
Axioma sit apud Euclidem, non tamen idem
Geometricum putandum est, quia Geometris
eo nimirum. Minus enim & tota Logica Ram.
in Schol. Matib. And Aristotle vindicates
such Propositions τὰ δὲ τοῦ μαθήματος
καλύπτειν εἰδικεῖται. From being
usurped by Particular Sciences ; ἀπαρτί^{τόν}
στὸν οὐρανόν, &c. Quia convenienter omni-
tate, & non alicui Generi separatim. 4.
Metab. c. 3. T. 7.

† Intelligentia dictorum ex causa est alibi
munda dicendi, quia non Sermoni res, sed
Rati Sermo est subiectus. S. Hilar. L. 4. de
Trin. Ex materia dicti di rigendus est ser-
jus. Tert. l. de Refut. carnis, c. 37.

|| Videenda differentia Similium ad Simili-
tud. Orig. Tract. 19. in S. March.
|| Recalendum est unde venit ista Senta-
tia, & que illam superiora papererint, qui-
busque causa dependet. S. Aug. Ep. 29.
Salte circumstantie Scripture illuminare
Sententiam. S. Aug. L. 83. Quæst. q.
69.

* Quia ambigunt & obcurcunt in nonnullis
Scriptura Sacra locis dicta videntur, per
ta qua libet certa, & indubitate habentur
declaratur. S. Basil. in Regulis contraria, Rg. 267. Manifestiora quoque præval-
ant, & de incertis certiora præscribant.
Tert. l. de Refut. c. 19. & 21. S. Aug. L.
3. De Doctr. Christi. c. 26. Moris et Scrip-
turarum obscuris manifesta submettere, &
quod Jesus sub exiguis verbis dixerint, aperte
voce profere. S. Hieron. in Esa. 19. prie.
Vid. S. 26. N. 4.

+ S. Aug. L. 3. de Doctr. Christiana.

themselves, so long as the last resolution of their Faith must rest (as they teach) upon the Tradition of the present Church only.

NUM. 6.

* And this is so necessary, that Bellarmine confesses, that if Tradition (which he relies upon) be not Divine: He and his can have no Faith. *Nos habemus fidem.* *Fides enim verbo Dei nititur.* L. 4. de verbo Dii. c. 4. S. At si ita esset.

And *A. C.* tells us, p. 47. To know that Scripture is Divine and Infallible in every part, is a Foundation so necessary, as if it were doubtfully questioned, all the Faith built upon Scripture falls to the ground. And he gives the same reason for it, p. 50. which *Bellarmino* doth.

as the last resolution of their Faith must rest on the Tradition of the present Church only; & to me very necessary, * that we be able to prove the Books of Scripture to be the *Word of God*, by some Authority that is absolutely Divine. For if they be warranted unto us by any Authority less than Divine, then all things contained in them (which have no greater assurance than the Scripture, in which they are read) are not *Objects of Divine belief*. And that once granted, will enforce us to yield, That all the *Articles of Christian Belief* have no greater assurance than *Humane, or Moral Faith, or Credulity* can afford. An Authority then simply Di-

vine must make good the Scriptures Infallibility, at least in the last Resolution of our Faith in that Point. This Authority can-

* Ecclesian spiritu & plaram esse, certe vnde.
Noa ut veritatem, authoritatem Iohannem
Caronicum tribuat, sed ut doceat illas,
qui dicit esse Caronicos. Nec si adhuc
vixit prout ad hysipodi sacros Libros con-
suecundos, protinus ibi acquirendum est,
sed nitra opore progrederi, & solidam Dei
veritati niti. Quia ex te intelligatur quid
sibi voluerit Augustinus, quam sit, Evan-
gelio non credetum, nisi, &c. M. Canis
L. 2. de Loci, c. 8. fol. 32. b. Non docet
sanctorum esse Evangelium idem in Ecclesiis
Authoritate, sed, &c. Ibid.

not be any *Testimony*, or *Voice* of the
* *Church* alone. For the *Church* consists of
men subject to *Error*; And no one of them,
since the *Apostles* times, hath been assisted
with so plentiful a measure of the *Blessed*
Spirit, as to secure him from being decei-
ved; And all the *Parts*, being all liable to
mistaking, and *fallible*, the *Whole* cannot pos-
sibly be *Infallible*; in, and of it self, and pri-
vileged from being deceived in some
Things, or other. And even in those *Funda-*
mental Things, in which the *Whole Uni-*

versal Church neither doth, nor can Err ; yet even there her Authority is not Divine, because She delivers those supernatural Truths by Promise of Assistance, yet tyed to Means ; And not by any special immediate Revelation, which is needless, required to the very least Degree of Divine Authority.

† Hook. L. 3.
S. 9.

* Stapl. Re-
lett. Cor. 4. q.
3. d. 1 ♂ 2.

A.C.P. 51.

And therefore our ^t Worthy do not only say, but prove,
That all the Churches Constitutions are of the nature of Humane
Law. * And some among you, not unworthy for their Learn-
ing, prove it at large, That all the Churches Testimony, or
Voyce, or Sentence (call it what you will) is but *suo modo*, or
aliquo modo, not simply; but in a manner Divine. Yea, and A.
C. himself, after all his debate comes to that, and no further,
That the Tradition of the Church is, at least in some sort, Divine
and Infallible. Now that which is Divine but in a sort or man-
ner, be it the Churches manner, is *aliquo modo non Divina*, in
a sort not Divine. But this Great Principle of Faith (the
Ground and Proof of whatsoever else is of Faith) cannot stand
firm upon a Proof that is, and is not, in a manner, and not in

a manner Divine; As it must, if we have no other Anchor than the External Tradition of the Church to lodge it upon, and hold it steady in the midst of those waves, which daily beat upon it.

Now here A.C. confesses expressly, That to prove the Books of Scripture to be Divine, we must be warranted by that which is Infallible. He confesses farther, that there can be no sufficient Infallible Proof of this, but Gods Word, written, or unwritten. And he gives his Reason for it: Because if the Proof be merely Humane, and Fallible, the Science or Faith which is built upon it, can be no better. So then this is agreed on by me, (yet leaving other men to travel by their own way, so be they can come to make Scripture thereby Infallible) That Scripture must be known to be Scripture by a sufficient, Infallible, Divine Proof. And that such Proof can be nothing but the Word of God, is agreed on also by me. Yea, and agreed on for me it shall be likewise, that Gods Word may be written and unwritten. For Cardinal * Bellarmine tells us truly, that it is not the writing, or printing, that make Scripture the Word of God; but it is the Prime Unerring Essential Truth, God himself, uttering, and revealing it to his Church, that makes it Verbum Dei, the Word of God. And this Word of God is uttered to men, either immediately by God himself, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and so twas to the Prophets and Apostles; Or mediately, either by Angels, to whom God had spoken first, and so the Law was given, * Gal. 3. and so also the Message was delivered to the Blessed Virgin, + S. Luke 1. or by the Prophets || and Apostles, and so the Scriptures were delivered to the Church. But their being written, gave them no Authority at all, in regard of themselves. Written or Unwritten, the Word was the same. But it was written, that it might be the better preserved, and continued with the more integrity to the use of the Church, and the more faithfully in our + Memories. And you have been often enough told (were truth, and not the maintaining of a party, the thing you seek for) that if you will shew us any such unwritten word of God delivered by his Prophets and Apostles, we will acknowledge it to be Divine and Infallible. So, written,

* Verbum Dei non est id, nec habet ullam Authoritatem, quia scriptum est in membra-
niis, sed quia à Deo profectum est. Bellar.
l. 4. de Verb. Dei. c. 2. §. Ecclesiastica
Traditiones.

* L'z ordinat per Angelos in mens Ma-
dicatoria, Gal. 3. 19.

+ S. Luk. 1. 30.

|| The Holy Ghost, &c. which spake by the Prophets, in Symb. Neth.

* Nam Propheta etiam circumscribitur Apollinis, multa fingebant corripetas sub hoc praecita & ritualibus ab Apostolicis uero locis effient tradidit: & propterea hanc ipsam causam Apollonis Doctrinam suam exponunt Literis comprehendunt, & Ecclesias commendare. Chem. Exam. Concil. Tradi-
de Traditionibus sub altero genere Tradit. And so also Jansen. Comment. in S. Joh.
5. 47. Sicut enim simius est quod man-
datur Literis, ita est culpabilis & major
non credere Scriptio, quam non credit Ver-
bus.

* Labilio est memoria, & ideo indig-
nus Scriptor. Dicendum quod verum est, sed hoc non habet nisi ex inuidentia
peccatorum. Henr. Agard. Sum. p. 1. Ar.
8. q. 4. s. Christus iste de peccato mori-
tuo testamentum transfert in tabulas diu duratas. Optat. L. 3. Christus iste non transsumit, sed ex Optati
sententiâ, Ejus Inspiratione, si non Iusti, Apolloni transluterunt.

of ~~written~~, that shall not stumble us. But then A.C. must not tell us, at least not think we shall swallow it into our Belief, That every thing which he says is the ~~written~~ Word of God, is so indeed.

N U M. 8,
* Bellar. L.
de Verbo Dei
non script.

I know Bellarmine hath written a whole Book * *De verbo Dei non scripto*, of the Word of God not written; in which he handles the Controversie concerning Traditions. And the Cunning is, to make his weaker Readers believe, that all that, which He, and his are pleased to call *Traditions*, are by and by no less to be received, and honoured, than the *unwritten Word of God* ought to be. Whereas 'tis a thing of easie knowledge, That the *unwritten Word of God* and *Tradition*, are not *Convertible Terms*, that is, are not all one. For there are many *Unwritten Words of God*, which were never delivered over to the Church, for ought appears: And there are many *Traditions* (affirmed, at least to be such by the *Church of Rome*) which were never warranted by any *Unwritten Word of God*.

NUM. 9.

Act. I. 3.

First, That there are many *Unwritten Words* of God which were never delivered over to the Church, is manifest. For when, or where were the words, which Christ spake to his *Apostles*, during the ^{* forty days} of his Conversing with them after his Resurrection, first delivered over to the Church? or what were the *Unwritten Words* he then spake? If neither He, nor His *Apostles*, or *Evangelists* have delivered them to the Church, the Church ought not to deliver them to her Children. Or

* Annuntiare aliquid Christi deus Catholico potest id quod acceptum, nonquam licet, nonquam licet. Vincent. Lit. c. 14. Et praesuppositum aliud inquit, nisi quod statutum est. S. Cyprianus ad Pompilius episcopum. Stephan. princ. + 1 Tim. 6.20 and 2 Tim. 1.14.

*Si ipsa (Ecclesia) contraria Scriptura
dictria (Fidelis) ipsi non credunt, &c.
Bem. a Grand. Sam. p. 1. d. 10. q. 1. And
Bellarmine himself, that he might the
more freely extenuate himself in the Cause
of Tradition, says, (but how truly
let other men judge) *Nullan Traditionem
admitterimus contra Scripturam.* L. 4. n.
Vnde dicit. cap. 3. 5. Deinde commen-*

*S. Aug. The. 96. in S. Joh. 18 illa
Vix. Multa habeo dicere, sed non po-
tuisse portare modis.*

• 1976 年 1 月 1 日起，新規例將取代舊規例。

if she doth tradere non traditionem, make a Tradition of that, which was not delivered to her, and by some of Them; then She is unfaithful to God, and doth not seruare depositum faithfully keep that which is committed to her Trust. ¶ I Tim. 6. And her Sons, which come to know it, are not bound to obey her Tradition against the Word of their Father. For wheresoever Christ holds his peace; or that his words are not Registered, I am of St. Augustinus Opinion, No man may dare without rashnes say they were these, or those. So, there were many Unwritten Words of God, which were never delivered over to the Church; and therefore never made Tradition. And there are

many Traditions, which cannot be said to be the Unwritten Word of God. For I believe, a Learned Romanist, that will weigh before he speaks, will not easily say, That to Anoint, or use Spittle in Baptism : or to use three Dippings in the use of that Sacrament : or divers other like Traditions, had their Rise

from any *Word of God unwritten*: Or if he be so hardy as to say so, 'tis gratis dictum, and he will have enough to do to prove it. So, there may be an *Unwritten Word of God*, which is no *Tradition*. And there are many Traditions, which are no *Unwritten Word of God*. Therefore *Tradition* must be taken two ways. Either, as it is the *Churches Act* delivering, or the Thing thereby delivered; and then 'tis *Humane Authority*, or from it, and unable *infallibly* to warrant *Divine Faith*, or to be the Object of it. Or else as it is the *Unwritten Word of God*: and then where ever it can be made to appear so, 'tis of *divine* and *infallible Authority*, no Question. But then I would have A. C. consider where he is in this Particular. He tells us, *We must know infallibly, that the Books of Holy Scripture are Divine, and that this must be done by Unwritten Tradition, but so, as that this Tradition is the Word of God unwritten.* Now let him but prove that this, or any *Tradition*, which the *Church of Rome* stands upon, is the *Word of God*, though *unwritten*, and the business is ended. But A. C. A.C. p. 49. must not think, that because the *Tradition of the Church* tells me these Books are *Verbum Dei, Gods Word*; and that I do both honour and believe this *Tradition*; That therefore this *Tradition it self* is *Gods Word* too; and so *absolutely sufficient* and *infallible* to work this Belief in me. Therefore for ought A. C. hath yet added, we must on with our Inquiry after this great Business, and *most necessary Truth*.

2. For the second way of proving, That Scripture should be N U M. 10. fully and sufficiently known, as by *Divine* and *Infallible Testimony, Lumine proprio*; by the resplendencie of that Light, which it bath in it self only, and by the witness that it can so give to it self, I could never yet see cause to allow. * For as + Hook. I. i. 5.4. there is no place in Scripture that tells us, Such Books containing such and such Particulars are the *Canon*, and *Infallible Will and Word of God*: So if there were any such place, that were no sufficient proof; For a man may justly alk another Book to bear witness of that; and again of that another; and where ever it were written in Scripture, that must be a part of the *Whole*. And no created thing can alone give witness to it self, and make it evident, nor one part testify for another, and satisfie where Reason will but offer to contest. Except those Principles only of *Natural knowledge*, which appear manifest by *intuitive light* of understanding, without any Discourse. And yet they also to the weaker sort require *Induction* preceding. Now this *Inbred light of Scripture* is a thing coincident with *Scripture it self*: and so, the *Principles*, and the *Conclusion* in this kind of proof should be entirely the same, which cannot be. Besides, if this *inward Light* were so clear, how could there have been any variety among the *Ancient Believers* touch-

* Euseb. L. 2.
c. 27. first. E-
dit. Basil.

1549.
† Euseb. L.
3 c. 25.

touching the Authority of S. * James, and S. Jude's Epistles, and the † Apocalyps, with other Books which were not received for divers years after the rest of the New Testament. For certainly, the Light which is in the Scripture, was the same then, which now it is. And how could the Gospel of S. Bartholomew, of S. Thomas, and other counterfeit pieces, obtain so much credit with some, as to be received into the Canon, if the evidence of this Light were either Universal, or Infallible, of, and by it self? And this, though I cannot approve, yet methinks you may, and upon probable grounds at least. For I hope no

† Except A. C. whose boldness herein I cannot but pity. For he denies this light to the Scripture, and gives it to Tradition? His words are, p. 52. *Tradition of the Church is of a company, which by its own light shews it self to be infallibly assynd, &c.*

* Isa. 44. &
psalm.

* Act. 28. 25.

† Romanist will deny, but that there is as much light in Scripture to manifest, and make ostension of it self to be infallibly the written Word of God, as there is in any Tradition of the Church, that it is Divine, and infallibly the Unwritten Word of God. And the Scriptures saying from the mouths of

the Prophets, * *Thus saith the Lord*, and from the mouths of the

† Apostles, that the Holy Ghost spake by them, are at least as able, and as fit to bear witness to their own Verity; as the Church is to bear witness to her own Traditions, by bare saying they come from the Apostles. And your selves would never go to the Scripture, to prove that there are Traditions, || as you do, if you did not think the Scripture as easie to be discovered by inbred light in it self, as Traditions by their light. And if this be so, then it is as probable at the least (which some of ours affirm) *That Scripture may be known to be the Word of God, by the Light and Lustre which it hath in it self, as it is which you * affirm*) *That a Tradition may be known to be such, by the light which it hath in it self:* which is an excellent Proposition to make sport withal, were this an Argument to be handled merrily.

N U M. 11. 3. For the third Opinion, and way of proving; either some think, that there is no sufficient warrant for this, unless they fetch it from the Testimony of the Holy Ghost, and so look in vain after special Revelations, and make themselves by this very Conceit, obnoxious, and easie to be led by all the whisperings of a seducing private spirit; or else you would fain have them think so. For your side, both upon this, and other Occasions, do often challenge, *That we resolve all our Faith in-*

* A Jesuite, under the name of T.S. set out a Book, An. 1630. which he called, *The Trial of the Protestant private spirit.*
† *in Testimonia Scriptura certam & indubitatem fidem praeferat, necessarium videtur ostendere, quod ipsa Divina Scriptura sunt Di Spiritus inspirata.* Orig. 4. cap. 1. q. 2. n. 20.

to the Dictates of a private Spirit; from which we shall ever prove our selves as free, if not freer than you. To the Question in hand then: Suppose it agreed upon, that there must be a † *Divine Faith, cui subesse non potest falsum,* under which can rest no possible error. That the Books of Scripture

ruse are the written Word of God : If they which go to the testimony of the Holy Ghost for proof of this, do mean by Faith, *Objectum Fidei*, the Object of Faith that is to be believed, then, no question, they are out of the ordinary way. For God never sent us by any word or warrant of his, to look for any such special, and private Testimony to prove which that Book is, that we must believe. But if by Faith they mean, the Habit, or *Act of Divine infused Faith*, by which virtue they do believe the Credible Object, and thing to be believed ; then their speech is true, and confessed by all Divines of all sorts. For Faith is the gift * of God, of God alone, and an infused † Habit, in respect whereof the Soul is merely recipient ; And therefore the sole Infuser, the Holy Ghost must not be excluded from that work, which none can do, but He. For the Holy Ghost, as || He first dictated the Scripture to the Apostles : * So did he not leave the Church in general, nor the true members of it in particular, without Grace to believe, what himself had revealed, and made Credible. So that Faith, as it is taken for the vertue of Faith, whether it be of this, or any other Article, & though it receive a kind of preparation, or Occasion of Beginning from the Testimony of the Church, as it proposeth, and induceth to the Faith ; yet it ends in God, revealing within, and teaching within, that which the Church preached without. For till the Spirit of God move the Heart of man, he cannot believe, be the Object never so Credible. The speech is true then, but quite || out of the State of this Question : which inquires only after a sufficient means to make this Object Credible, and fit to be believed, against all impeachment of folly and temerity in Belief, whether men do actually believe it or not. For which no man may expect inward private Revelation, without the external means of the Church, unless perhaps the * case of Necessity be excepted, when a man lives in such a time and place as excludes him from all ordinary means ; in which I dare not offer

* 1 Cor. 12.3. 4.

Datus nobis a Deo, &c. S. Aug. in Psal. 87.

† Quia homo afflito eis qua sunt fiduci, elevatur supra Naturam suam, operari quod hoc infinitum ex supernaturali principio interiori moveantur, quod est Deus. Tho. 2. 22. n. 6. A. 1.c. And your own Divines agree in this, That Fides acquisita is not sufficient for any Article, but there must be Fides infusa, before there can be Divine Certainty. Fides acquisita iniurit conuersari humanae. Ad quam modum & Saraceni suis Preceptoribus, & Judaei suis Rabini, & Genes suis Philosophi, & omnes suis Majoribus inherent : non sic Christiani, sed per interiorum lumen infusam a Spiritu Sancto, quo firmans & certissime moventur ad credendum, &c. Canus. L.2. Lecor. c. 2. §. Jam si haec.

|| Symb. Nicen. The Holy Ghost spake by the Prophets, &c. Et i. S. Pet. 2. 21. Quid meus est, quo docet animas ea quae sunt a me? Docuit enim Propheta tuus.

S. Aug. L.1. Confess. c. 19,

* Nec enim Ecclesia Testimonium, aut Juridicum praeditamus, Dei Spiritum, vel ab Ecclesia docente, vel a nobis auarentibus, exclusimus, sed utробique disertis includimus, &c. Stapl. trip. contr. Whitak. c. 3.

+ Fides quecepit ab Ecclesia Testimonio, quatenus proponit & inducit ad Fidem, definit in Deo habens reuelationem, & inde docente quod satis Ecclesia predicavit. Sapl. Redf. Com. 4. 4. 3. 4. 4. When grave and learned men do sometimes hold, that of this Principle there is no proof, but by the Testimony of the Spirit, &c. I think it is not their meaning, to exclude all outward Proof, &c. but rather this, That all other means are ineffectual of themselves to work Faith, without the special Grace of God. Hook. &c. Lib. 3. §. 8.

|| Debet habere Fidei quoad fieri ejus, & generationem, quem a Deo innatim solo per Scriptura inspicitionem, &c. Henr. à Gaud. Sun. a. 10. q. 1. lit. D.

* Stapl. Redf. Com. 4. Q. 3. A. 2. Doth not only affirm it, but proves it too, a pariter ratione, in case of necessity, where there is no Contempt of the external means.

to shut up God from the *souls of men*, nor to tye him to those ordinary ways and means, to which yet in great wisdom and providence He hath tied and bound all *mankind*.

NUM. 12.

Private Revelation then hath nothing ordinarily to do, to make the *Object Credible* in this, *That Scripture is the Word of God*, or in any other *Article*. For the *Question* is of such outward, and evident means, as other men may take notice of, as well as our selves. By which if there arise any Doubting, or Infirmitiy in the *Faith*, others may strengthen us, or we afford means

* Quid cum singulis agitur, Deus scit qui agit, & ipsi cum quibus agitur, sciunt. Quid autem agatur cum genere Humano, per Historiam commendari volunt, & per Prophetiam. 3. Aug. de veris Relig. c. 25.

to support them: Whereas the * *Testimony of the Spirit*, and all *private Revelation* is within, nor felt, nor seen of any, but him that bath it. So that hence can be drawn no proof to others. And *Miracles* are not suf-

ficient alone to prove it, unles both *They*, and the *Revelation* too, agree with the *Rule of Scripture*; which is now an *unalterable Rule* by † *man*, or *Angel*.

† Gal. 1. 8.
Act. 1. 32.

To all this *A. C.* says nothing, save that I seem not to admit of an *Infallible Impulsion* of a *private Spirit*, ex parte *subjecti*, without any *infallible Reason*, and that sufficiently applied ex parte *objecti*, which if I did admit, would open a gap to all *Enthusiasms*, and dreams of *fanatical men*. Now for this yet I thank him. For I do not only seem not to admit, but I do most clearly reject this phrase in the words going before.

NUM. 13.

* utrum tamquam factum a Deo etiam Ratio-
ne Humana, Non quidem ad probandum, Fidem ipsam, sed ad mensi-
ficiandum aliquam alia, que traduntur in
hoc Doctrinam. Tho. p. 1. q. 1.

A. 8. ad 2.
Pessimum ratio-
nis status homo
studiorum. De-
cim. S. Aug.

de veris Relig.
c. 26. (Palli-
bus, verbo)

bus, verbo

et, sed nec sequis, nec solis) Non Invisibilis Dei sicuti modo quantum ad placitum percipit Fides, quam Ratio

naturae ex Creaturis in Deum procedens. Tho. 2. 2. q. 2. A. 3. ad 3.

+ animalis, homo non percipit. Cor. 2. 14.

¶ Quia scientia est certitudinem habens ex natura lumen Rationis humanae, que per se videtur? Theologis enim

(que docet & Objectum & Notitiam Fidei, sicut & Fidem ipsam) certitudinem habet ex lumine Divino. /Vic-
tus, que deinceps non potest. Tho. p. 1. q. 1. A. 5. c. ut ipsa pax voluntatis facta, quod crederemus intelligent mereamur. S. Aug. 2. q. 1. Ep. Maximej. A. 1. Fundamentum. c. 14. Hoc autem ita intelligendum est, ut scientia certior sit Certitudine Evidentie; Fides vero certior Firmitate Adhensionis. Major lumen in Scientia, major robur in Fide. Et hoc, quia in Fide, & ad fidem Altius imperatus Voluntatis concurreat. Credere enim est Altius imperatus Vero affectus producens ex Voluntate impellit. Biol. in 2. Sec. d. 23. q. 2. A. 1. Unde Tho. intelligere cre-
dientis determinatur ad Unum, non per Rationem, sed per Voluntatem; & idcirco Assensus hic accipitur pro Alio in-
tellicibilis, secundum quod à Voluntate determinatur ad Unum. 2. 2. q. 2. A. 1. ad 3.

In this Particular, the Books called the *Scripture*, are commonly and constantly reputed to be the *Word of God*, and so infallible Verity, to the least point of them. Doth any man doubt this? The world cannot keep him from going to weigh it at the *Balance of Reason*, whether it be the Word of God, or not. To the same *Weights* he brings the *Tradition* of the Church, the *inward motives* in Scripture it self, all *Testimonies* within, which seem to bear witness to it; and in all this, there is no harm: the danger is, when a man will use *no other Scale*, but *Reason*, or prefer *Reason* before any other *Scale*. For the *Word of God*, and the *Book* containing it, refuse not to be weighed by * *Reason*. But the *Scale* is not large enough to contain, nor the *Weights* to measure out the true vertue, and full force of either. *Reason* then can give no *supernatural* ground, into which a man may resolve his Faith. *That Scripture is the Word of God infallibly*; yet *Reason* can go so high, as it can prove that *Christian Religion*, which rests upon the *Authority* of this *Book*, stands upon surer grounds of *Nature, Reason, common Equity, and Justice*, than any thing in the World, which any *Infidel*, or meer *Naturalist*, hath done, doth, or can adhere unto, against it, in that which he *makes, accounts, or assumes* as *Religion* to himself.

The *Ancient Fathers* relied upon the *Scriptures*, no Christians more; and having to do with *Philosophers* (men very well seen in all the subtleties, which *Natural Reason* could teach, or learn) They were often put to it, and did as often make it good, That they had sufficient warrant to rely, so much as They did, upon *Scripture*. In all which Disputes, because they were to deal with *Infidels*, they did labour to make good the *Authority* of the *Book of God* by such Arguments, as Unbelievers themselves could not but think *reasonable*, if they weighed them with indifference. For though I set the *Mysteries of Faith* above *Reason*, which is their proper place; yet I would have no man think They contradict *Reason*, or the *Principles* thereof. No sure. For *Reason* by her own light can discover how firmly the *Principles* of *Religion* are true: But all the Light she hath will never be able to find them false. Nor may any man think that the *Principles* of *Religion*, even this, *That Scriptures are the Word of God*, are so indifferent to a *Natural eye*, that it may with as just cause lean to one part of the *Contradiction*, as to the other. For though this Truth, *That Scripture is the Word of God*, is not so demonstratively evident, *a priori*, as to enforce Assent: yet it is strengthen'd so abundantly with probable Arguments, both from the *Light of Nature* it self, and *Hu-*

* Si vobis, rationi, & veritati conscientia videntur, in pretio habete, &c. de mysteriis Religionis, Justin. Mart. Apol. 2. Igitur, si sunt dispositio Rationis, &c. Tertull. L. de Carne Christi, c. 18. Rationalib[us] est credere Deum esse Autorem Scripturae. Henr. à Gand. Sum. Th. 1. Art. 9. q. 3.

manc Testimony, that he must be very wilful, and self-conceited, that shall dare to suspect it.

NUM. 16. Nay, yet farther, * It is not altogether impossible to prove it

* Hook. L. 3. S. 3. Si Plato ist vero
veret, & me interrogauerit non respondar-
tur, &c. S. Aug. de veritate Relig. c. 3. vi.
deamus quatuor Ratio potius probandi. &
visibilibus ad invisibilia, &c. Ibid. c.
29.

+ Si vim spe- by another Greater, He were neither Prince, nor Absolute, nor
dias, Deus Va- + God, in their own Theologie. Now they must grant, That
lentissimes est,
Arist. de Ani- that God, and Christ, which the Scripture teaches, and we be-
do, c. 7. Domini- lieve, is the only true God, and no other with him, and so de-
ce. Meliorata.
Cicero de L. Principle about the Deity, That God cannot be commanded, and
-15T. 100 forced out of possession: For || their Gods,

¶. de Saturnus, & Serapis, & Jupiter.
& quacumq[ue] Demorum coluisse, vici dolo-
re q[ui]d fuit, eloquuntur. Nec utique in
turpiditudine sui nonnullis praesertim vistro-
rum afflictibus, mentitur, q[ui]d illis bellici-
bus esse eos Demones de se verum confe-
ttere credite. Adversari enim per deum
verum, & saepe inosci, &c. Arnob. 8.
contra Gent. Or Murius Felix, 25. 15
now thought.

into Devils, to their own reproach, especially in the presence of
them that worshipped them, were they not forced. This, many of
the Unbelievers saw; therefore they could not (in very force
of Reason) but they must either deny their God, or deny their
Principle in Nature. Their long Custome would not forsake
their God, and their Reason could not forget their Principle.
If Reason therefore might judge among them, they could not
worship any thing that was under Command. And if it be rea-
sonable to do, and believe this, then why not reasonable also to
believe, That Scripture is his Word, given to teach himself,
and Christ, since there they find Christ * doing that, and + gi-
ving power to do it after, which themselves saw executed upon
their Devil-Gods?

* S. Mat. 12.

22.

+ S. Mat. 16.

17.

NUM. 17. Besides, whereas all other written Laws have scarce had the
honour to be duly observed, or constantly allowed worthy ap-
probation in the Particular places, where they have been es-
tablished for Laws; this Law of Christ, and this Canon of Scrip-
ture the container of it, is, or hath been received in almost * all
Nations under Heaven. And wheresoever it hath been reci-
tatum Divina-

* Si Libri
quaquo modo se
habent sancti
Nations under Heaven. And wheresoever it hath been reci-
tatum Divina-
ram rerum plena propriae generis humani confessionis diffundatur, &c. S. Aug. de util. Cris. c. 7. Scriptura
summa dispositione Providentia super omnes omnium Gentium Literas, omnia p[ro]p[ri]a genera ingeniorum humanae
Divina Excellens Authoritate subiecta. S. Aug. 11. de Civit. Dei, c. 1.

At in omni orbis terrarum, in omni Gracis, & universis Nationibus, immensi sunt, & immensi, qui reliqui
Patriis Legibus, &c. ad observantiam Moysi, & Christi, &c. Origen. 4. w[er]gi a[ct]o X[er]v. cap. 1.

ved,

ved, it hath been both approved for *Unchangeable good*, and believed for *Infallible verity*. This perswasion could not have been wrought in men of all sorts, but by working upon their *Reason*, unless we shall think all the *World* unreasonable, that received it. And certainly God did not give this admirable faculty of *Reasoning* to the Soul of man, for any cause more prime than this, to *discover*, or to *Judge* and *allow* (within the Sphere of its own Activity, and not presuming farther) of the way to Himself; when and howsoever it should be discovered.

One great thing that troubled *Rational men*, was that which stumbled the *Manichee* (an Heresie it was, but more than half *Pagan*) namely, *That somewhat must be believed, before much could be known*. Wise men use not to believe, but what they know: And the *Manichee* * scorned the *Orthodox Christian*, as *light of Belief*, promising to lead no Disciple after him, but upon evident knowledge. This stumbles many; but yet the Principle, *That somewhat must be believed, before much can be known*, stands firm in *Reason* still. For if in all Sciences there be some *Principles*, which cannot be proved; if *Reason* be able to see this, and confess it; if almost all *Artists* have granted it; if in the *Mathematicks*, where are the Exactest Demonstrations, there be *Quaedam postulata*, some things to be first Demanded, and granted, before the *Demonstration* can proceed: Who can justly deny that to *Divinity*, *A Science of the Highest Object*, *God Himself*, which he easily and reasonably grants to inferior Sciences, which are more within his reach? And as all Sciences suppose some *Principles* without proving; so have they almost all, some *Text*, some *Authority*, upon which they rely in some measure; and it is *Reason* they should. For though these Sciences make not their *Texts Infallible*, as *Divinity* doth; yet full consent, and prudent *Examination*, and long *continuance*, have won *reputation* to them, and settled *reputation* upon them, very deservedly. And were these *Texts* more void of Truth than they are, yet it were fit, and reasonable to uphold their credit, that *Novices*, and young *Beginners* in a Science, which are not able to work strongly upon *Reason*, nor *Reason* upon them, may have *Authority* to believe, till they can learn to Conclude from *Principles*, and so to know. Is this also reasonable in other Sciences, and shall it not be so in *Theology*, to have a

Text, a *Scripture*, a *Rule*, which *Novices* may be taught first to believe, that so they may after come to the knowledge of those things, which out of this rich *Principle*, and * *Treasure* are De-

* Irridet in
catholica Fi-
dei disciplina,
quod iubentur
bonis creden-
ti, nos autem,
etc. S. Aug. I.
Rerab. c. 14.

* And therefore S. Aug. 2. in Doctr. christ. c. 8. would have men make themselves perfect in reading the Letter of the Scripture, even before they understand it. *Eas non as habent,* *etsi nesciunt intellexisse, tamen lectio daturat*. No question but to make them ready against they understand it. And as School-Masters make their Scholars come their Grammar-Rules by heart, that they may be ready for their use, when they better understand them.

ducible? I yet see not how right Reason can deny these Grounds; and if it cannot, then a mere Natural man may be thus far convinced, *That the Text of God is a very Credible Text.*

NUM. 19.

Well, these are the four ways, by most of which, men offer to prove the Scripture to be the Word of God, as by a Divine and Infallible Warrant. And, it seems, no one of these doth it alone. The Tradition of the present Church is too weak, because that is not absolutely Divine. The Light which is in Scripture it self, is not bright enough, it cannot bear sufficient witness to it self. The Testimony of the Holy Ghost, that is most infallible, but ordinarily it is not so much as considerable in this Question, which is not, how, or by what means we believe, but how the Scripture may be proposed as a Credible Object, fit for belief. And for Reason, no man expects, that that should prove it, it doth service enough, if it enable us to disprove that which misguided men conceive against it. If none of these then be an Absolute and sufficient means to prove it, either we must find out another, or see what can be more wrought out of them. And to all this again A. C. says nothing.

NUM. 20.

For the Tradition of the Church then, certain it is, we must distinguish the Church, before we can judge right of the Validity of the Tradition. For if the speech be of the Primitive Christian Church, the Apostles, Disciples, and such as had immediate Revelation from Heaven; no question, but the Voice and Tradition of this Church is Divine, not *aliquo modo*, in a sort, but simply; and the Word of God from them, is of like Validity, written, or delivered. And against this Tradition (of which kind this, *That the Books of Scripture are the Word of God, is the most general and uniform*) the Church of England

* L. 1. cont. Epist. Pauli 1. 9. *quod non
nos credidit Evangelio, neque credimus
Ecclesia communem Authoritatem.*

† Ockham. Dial. p. 1 L. 1. t. 4. *hinc
gitur solam eam Ecclesiam que sicut tempore
Apostolorum.*

|| Biel. l. 2. c. 12. *et c. Massa. Tempore
Christi & Apostolorum, et. And so doth
S. Aug. take Ecclesiam a Script.*

*But this will not serve your turn. The Tradition of the present Church must be as Infallible, as that of the Primitive. But the contrary to this is proved * before, because this Voice of the present Church, is not simply Divine. To what end then serves any*

* §. 16. N. 6. *the contrary to this is proved * before, because this Voice of the present Church, is not simply Divine. To what end then serves any*

any Tradition of the present Church? To what? Why to a very good end. For first, it serves by a full consent to work upon the minds of *unbelievers*, to move them to read, and to consider the Scripture, which (they hear by so many Wise, Learned, and Devout men) is of no meaner esteem than the *Word of God*. And secondly, It serves among *Novices*, *Weaklings*, and *Doubters* in the Faith, to instruct, and confirm them, till they may acquaint themselves with, and understand the Scripture, which the Church delivers as the *Word of God*. And thus again some of your own understand the fore-cited Place of St. *Augustine*, *I would not believe the Gospel, &c.*

* For he speaks it either of *Novices*, or *Doubters* in the Faith, or else of such as were in part *Insidels*.

You at the Conference (though you omit it here) would needs have it, that S. *Augustine spoke even of the faithful*, which I cannot yet think: For he speaks to the *Manichees*, and they had a great part of the *Insidel* in them. And the words immediately before these, are, *If thou shouldest find any, Qui Evangelio nondum credit, which did not yet believe the Gospel, what wouldest thou do to make him believe?*

|| Ego vero non, Truly I would not, &c. So to these two ends it serves, and there need be no Question between us. But then every thing, that is the *first Inducer* to believe, is not by and by either the *Principal Motive*, or the *chief, and last Object of Belief*, upon which a man may rest his Faith. Unless we shall be of * *Jacobi Almaini's Opinion*; That we are *per prius & magis*, first and more bound to belieye the *Church*, than the *Gospel*. Which your own Learned men, as you may see by *Mel. Camm*, reject as Extreme *foolish*, and so indeed it is. The first knowledge then after the *Quid Novitii* is known by *Grammat*) that helps to open a mans understanding, and prepares him to be able

to Demonstrate a Truth, and make it evident, is his *Logick*: made a *Demonstration*, he resolves the knowledge of his Conclusion, not into his *Grammatical*, or *Logical Principles*, but into the *Immediate Principles* out of which it is deduced. So in this Particular, a man is probably led by the *Authority* of the present Church, as by the *first informing, inducing, persuading Means*, to believe the Scripture to be the *Word of God*: but when he hath studied, considered, and compared this Word with

* *Sive Insidels, sive in Fide Novitii. Cap. Lc. 1. 2. c. 8. Novanti, aut omnino nesciunt Scripturam. Stapl. Relig. Cont. 4. q. 1. A. 3.*

+ *Quid si satanum Fideles, etiam Ecclesiasticis Authoritatibus communiter, ut Scripturam recipient: Non tamne inde sequitur an hoc modo prout persuaderet: aut nulla alia & fortiorque ratione induci? Quis autem christianus, et ipsa Ecclesia Christi, commendat Scripturam Christi, non communit? Whilom. Disq. de sacra Scriptura. Caput. 3. q. 9. n. 8. ubi citas locum hanc. S. Aug.*

|| Et ibid. *Quidno insensibili accipitur credere Evangelium. Therefore he speaks of himself, when he did not believe.*

* *Certum est quod credere credere omnibus existens in Sacra Causa, quia Ecclesia studi ex exercitio aliena. Ergo per prius & magis tamen credere Ecclesia, quia Evangelium. Almain. 10. 3. Disq. 24. Capit. 6. Dub. 6. And to make a shew of proof for this, he falsifies S. Aug. most notoriously, and reads that known place, not Nisi in communi (at all read in iudeis compellere. Pater quis dicit Augustinus, Redigere nos credentes ad nos ne compellere Ecclesia Authoritas. Ibid. And so also Gorius reads it, In Dilectis. urinam, que credende sunt. Gregor. 1. 9. 414. S. 3. But in a most ancient Manuscript in Corp. Chr. College Library in Cambridge, the words are, Nisi in communi, &c.*

+ *Camus L. 2. dubit. 1. 8. q. 14. 3. q. 16. Momo.*

to Demonstrate a

But when he hath

it self, and with other Writings, with the help of Ordinary Grace, and a mind morally induced, and reasonably persuaded by the Voyce of the Church; the Scripture then gives greater, and higher reasons of Credibility to it self, than Tradition alone could give. And then he that Believes, resolves his last, and full Assent, *That Scripture is of Divine Authority*, into internal arguments found in the Letter it self, though found by the Help and Direction of Tradition without, and Grace within.

And the resolution that is rightly grounded, may now endure to pitch, and rest it self upon the Helps, but upon that Divine Light, which the Scripture, no Question, hath in it self, but is not kindled, till these Helps come. *Thy Word is*

*Light**: to David. A Light? Therefore it is as much *manifestationum sui*, as *aliquam*, a manifestation to it self, as to other things which it shews: but still, not till the *Candie be Lighted*; not till there hath been a Preparing Instruction, *What Light it is*.

Children call the *Sun* and *Moon*, *Candles*; Gods *Candles*. They see the light as well as men, but cannot distinguish between them, till some *Tradition*, and *Education* hath informed their

Reason. And * *animis homi*, the natural man sees some *Light* of *Moral counsel*, and instruction in Scripture, as well as Believers; But he takes all that glorious Lustre for *Candle-light*, and cannot distinguish between the *Sun*, and twelve to the *Pound*, till *Tradition* of the Church, and Gods Grace put to it, have cleared his understanding. So *Tradition* of the present Church, is the first Moral Motive to Belief. But the Belief it self, *That the Scripture is the Word of God*, rests † upon the Scripture, when a man finds it to answer, and exceed all that which the Church gave in Testimony, as will after appear.

And as in the Voyce of the Primitive and Apostolical Church, there was simply *Divine Authority*, delivering the Scripture, as Gods Word; so, after Tradition of the present Church hath taught, and informed the Soul, the Voyce of God, is plainly heard in *Scripture it self*. And then here's double Authority, and both Divine, that confirms Scripture to be the Word of God. *Tradition of the Apostles delivering it*; And the internal worth and argument in the Scripture, obvious to a Soul prepared by the present Churches *Tradition*, and Gods Grace.

NUM. 22. The Difficulties which are pretended against this, are not many, and they will easily vanish. For first, you pretend, we go

go to *Private Revelations for Light to know Scripture*. No, we do not, you see it is excluded out of the very state of the Question : and we go to the *Tradition of the present Church*, and by it, as well as you. Here we differ ; we use the Tradition of the present Church, as the *first Motive*, not as the *Last Resolution* of our Faith. We *Resolve* only into * Prime Tradition Apostolical, and Scripture it self.

Clesia Propheticorum scriptis, & Apostolorum prædicatione initio fundata fuit, ubique reperitur ea Doctrina, &c.

* Calv. Inflit.

I.C.S. S. 2.

Christianæ Ec-

Secondly, you pretend, we do not, nor cannot know the *prime Apostolical Tradition*, but by the *Tradition of the present Church* ; and that therefore, if the Tradition of the present Church be not Gods *unwritten Word, and Divine*, we cannot yet know Scripture to be Scripture, by a *Divine Authority*. Well ! Suppose I could not know the *prime Tradition* to be Divine, but by the *present Church*, yet it doth not follow, that therefore I cannot know Scripture to be the Word of God by a *Divine Authority* ; because *Divine Tradition* is not the sole, and only means to prove it. For suppose, I had not, nor could have full assurance of *Apostolical Tradition Divine* ; yet the moral persuasion, reason, and force of the *present Church*, is ground enough to move any reasonable man, that it is fit he should read the Scripture, and esteem very reverently and highly of it. And this once done, the *Scripture* hath then, *In, and Home-Arguments* enough to put a Soul, that hath but ordinary Grace, out of Doubt, *That Scripture is the Word of God, Infal-* *lible and Divine*.

Thirdly, you pretend, that we make the *Scripture* absolute-
ly, and fully to be known *Lumine suo*, by the Light and Te-
stimony which it hath *in*, and gives to it self. Against this, you
give reason for your selves, and proof from us. Your Reason is,
*If there be sufficient Light in Scripture to shew it self, then eve-
ry man that can, and doth but read it, may know it presently to
be the Divine Word of God* ; which we see by daily experience,
men neither do, nor can. First, it is not absolutely, nor univer-
sally true, There is * *sufficient Light* ; therefore every man
may see it. Blinde men are men, and cannot see it ; and
† *sensual men*, in the Apostles judgment, are such : Nor
may we deny, and put out this Light, as *insufficient*, be-
cause *blind eyes* cannot, and *perverse eyes* will not see it ;
no more than we may deny meat to be sufficient for nou-
rishment, though men that are heart-sick, cannot eat it. Next,
we do not say, *That there is such a full Light in Scripture, as that*
every man upon the first sight must yeeld to it ; such Light as is † *Cor. 2.14.*
found in Prime Principles ; *Every whole is greater than a Part*
of the same ; and this, *The same thing cannot be, and not be, at*
the

* And where
Hooker uses
this very Ar-
gument, as he
doth, I. 3. §. 8.
his words are
not, If there
be sufficient
Light ; But if
that Light be
Evident.

the same time, and in the same respect. These carry a natural Light with them, and evident : for the Terms are no sooner understood, then the Principles themselves are fully known, to the convincing of mans understanding, and so they are the beginning of knowledge ; which, where it is perfect, dwells in *full Light* : but such a full Light we do neither say is, nor require to be in Scripture ; and if any particular man do, let him answer for himself. The Question is, only of such a *Light in Scripture*, as is of force to breed faith, that it is the Word of God ; not to make a *perfect knowledge*. Now *Faith*, of whatsoever it is, this or other Principle, is an *Evidence* *, as well as *Knowledge* ; and the *Belief* is firmer than any Knowledge can be, because it rests upon *Divine Authority*, which cannot deceive ; whereas *Knowledge* (or at least he that thinks he knows) is not ever certain in Deductions from Principles. † But the *Evidence* is not so clear. For it is *of things not seen*, in regard of the Object ; and in regard of the Subject that sees, it is *in enigma*, in a Glass, or dark speaking. Now God doth not require a full *Demonstrative Knowledge* in us, that the Scripture is his Word, and therefore in his Providence hath kindled in it no Light for that, but he requires our *Faith* of it, and such a certain *Demonstration*, as may fit that. And for that, he hath left sufficient *Light* in Scripture to *Reason* and *Grace* meeting, where the Soul is *morally prepared* by the *Tradition of the Church* ; unless you be of *Bellarmino's Opinion*, *That to believe there are any Divine Scriptures, is not omnino necessary to Salvation*.

* S. 16. N. 13.

|| Heb. 11. 1.

* 1 Cor. 13. 12.

And A. c. confesses, p.

52. That this very thing in Question

may be known infallibly, when 'tis known but obscurely.

E: Scous in

3. Dis. 23. 4.

I fol. 41. B.

Hoc modo fac-

tile est videre

quoniam Fi-

des est cum enigmate, & obscuritate. Quis Habens Fides non credit Articulum esse verum ex Boidentia Objeci, sed propter hoc, quod affinitas veritatis in fundato Habetur, & in hoc revelante Credibilita.

† Bellar. I. 3. de Eccles. c. 14. Credere alios esse divinas Scripturas, non est omnis necessarium ad salutem. I will not break my Discourse, to rise this speech of *Bellarmino* ; it is bad enough in the best sense, that favour it self can give it. For if he mean by *omnis*, that it is not *aliquatenus*, or *scopi* necessary to believe there is Divine Scripture, and a written Word of God ; that's false, that being granted, which is among all Christians. That there is a Scripture : And God would never have given a Supernatural unnecessary thing. And if he means by *omnis*, that it is not *in any wise* necessary, then it is sensibly false. For the greatest upholders of Tradition that ever were, made the Scripture very necessary in all the Ages of the Church. So it was necessary, because it was given, and given, because God thought it necessary. Besides, upon *Roman Grounds*, this I think will follow : That which the Tradition of the present Church delivers, as necessary to believe, is *omnis* necessary to salvation : But that there are Divine Scriptures, the Tradition of the present Church delivers, as necessary to believe : Therefore to believe there are Divine Scriptures, is *omnis* (be the sense of the word what it can) necessary to Salvation. So *Bellarmino* is herein foul, and unable to stand upon his own ground. And he is the more, partly, because he avouches this Proposition for truth after the New Testament written. And partly, because he might have seen the state of this Proposition carefully examined by *Gaudio*, and distinguished by times. Jam. p. 1. A. 8. q. 4. fin.

N II. M. 25. The Authority which you pretend against this, is out of

* Lib. I. §. 14. * Hooker: Of things necessary, the very chiefest is to know, what Books we are bound to esteem Holy ; which Point is confessed

† Proph. Apol. Tract. I. §. 10. (the Store-house for all Priests that will be idle, and yet seem well

N. 3.

well read;) tell us, That * Hooker gives a very sensible Demonstration : It is not the Word of God, which doth, or possibly can assure us, that we do well to think it is his Word : for if any one Book of Scripture did give Testimony to all ; yet still that Scripture, which giveth credit to the rest, would require another to give credit unto it. Nor could we ever come to any pause, to rest our assurance this way : so that unless, beside Scripture, there were something that might assure, &c. And † this he acknowledgeth (saith Brierly) is the Authority of Gods Church. Certainly, Hooker gives a true, and a sensible Demonstration ; but Brierly wants fidelity, and integrity, in citing him : For in the first place, Hooker's speech is, *Scripture it self cannot teach this* ; nor can the Truth say, that Scripture it self can. It must needs ordinarily have Tradition, to prepare the mind of a man to receive it. And in the next place, where he speaks so sensibly, That *Scripture* cannot bear witness to it self, nor one part of it to another ; that is grounded upon Nature, which admits no created thing to be witness to it self ; and is acknowledged by our Saviour, || *If I bear witness to my self, my witness is not true*, that is, *is not of force to be reasonably accepted for Truth*. But then it is more than manifest, that Hooker delivers his Demonstration of *Scripture alone*. For if Scripture hath another proof, nay many other proofs to usher it, and lead it in, then no Question, it can both prove, and approve it self. His words are, *so that unless, besides Scripture, there be, &c. Besides Scripture* ; therefore he excludes not *Scripture*, though he call for another Proof to lead it in, and help in assurance, namely, *Tradition*, which no man, that hath his brains about him, denies. In the two other Places, Brierly fallifies shamefully, for folding up all that Hooker says, in these words ; *This (other means to assure us besides Scripture) is the Authority of Gods Church* ; he wrinkles that *Worthy Author* desperately, and shrinks up his meaning. For in the former place abused by Brierly, no man can set a better state of the Question between *Scripture*, and *Tradition*, than Hooker doth : * His words are these : *The Scripture is the ground of our Belief : The Authority of man (that is the Name he gives to Tradition) is the Key which opens the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scripture*. I ask now ; When a man is entred, and hath viewed a house, and upon viewing likes it, and upon liking resolves unchangeably to dwell there ; doth he set up his Resolution upon the *Key*, that let him in ? No sure ; but upon the *Goodness* and *Commodiousness*, which he sees in the House. And this is all the difference (that I know) between us in this Point ; In which, do you grant (as you ought to do), that we resolve our Faith into *Scripture as the Ground* ; and we will never deny, that *Tradition* is the *Key* that lets us in. In

|| S. Joh. 5.31.
He speaks of
himself as
man.

S. Joh. 8.13.

* L.2.S.7.

* L. 3. S. 6.

the latter place, Hooker is as plain, as constant to himself, and Truth : * His words are : *The first outward Motive, leading men so to esteem of the Scripture, is the Authority of Gods Church, &c. But afterwards, the more we bestow our Labour in reading, or learning the Mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing it self doth answer our received opinion concerning it : so that the former inducement prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministred farther Reason.* Here then again, in his Judgment, Tradition is the first Inducement ; but the farther Reason, and Ground, is the Scripture. And Resolution of Faith ever settles upon the Farthest Reason it can, not upon the First Inducement. So that the State of this Question is firm, and yet plain enough, to him that will not shut his eyes.

NUM. 25.
A.C. p. 52.

Now here after a long silence A. C. thrusts himself in again, and tells me, That if I would consider the Tradition of the Church, not only as it is the Tradition of a Company of Fallible men, in which sense the Authority of it (as himself confesses) is but Humane, and Fallible, &c. But as the Tradition of a Company of men assisted by Christ, and his Holy Spirit ; in that sense I might easily finde it more than an Introduction, indeed as much as would amount to an Infallible Motive. Well, I have considered The Tradition of the present Church both these ways. And I find that A. C. confesses, That in the first sense, the Tradition of the Church is meer humane Authority, and no more. And therefore in this sense, it may serve for an Introduction to this Belief, but no more. And in the second sense, as it is not the Tradition of a Company of men only, but of men assisted by Christ, and His Spirit : In this second sense I cannot finde, that the Tradition of the present Church is of Divine and Infallible Authority, till A. C. can prove, That this Company of men (the Roman Prelates, and their Clergy he means) are so fully, so clearly, so permanently assisted by Christ, and his Spirit, as may reach to Infallibility, to a Divine Infallibility, in this, or any other Principle, which they teach. For every Assistance of Christ, and the Blessed spirit, is not enough to make the Authority of any Company of men Divine, and infallible ; but such, and so great an Assistance only, as is purposely given to that effect. Such an Assistance the Prophets under the Old Testament, and the Apostles under the New had ; but neither the High-Priest with his Clergy in the Old, nor any Company of Prelates, or Priests in the New, since the Apostles, ever had it. And therefore, though as the intreaty of A. C. I have considered this very well ; yet I cannot, no not in this Assisted sense, think the Tradition of the present Church, Divine and Infallible, or such Company of men to be worthy of Divine and infallible Credit, and sufficient to breed in us Divine, and Infallible Faith.

A.C. p. 52.

Which

Which I am sorry A. C. should affirm so boldly as he doth. ^{A. C. p. 52.}
 What? That Company of men (the Roman Bishop, and his Clergy) of Divine and Infallible Credit, and sufficient to breed in us Divine and Infallible Faith? Good God! Whither will these men go? Surely, they are wise in their generation, but that makes them never a whit the more the Children of Light *: ^{* S. Luke 16. 8.}
 S. Luk. 16. And could they put this home upon the world (as they are gone far in it) what might they not effect? How might they, and would they then Lord it over the Faith of Christendom, contrary to ^{+ 1} S. Peter's Rule (whose Successors certainly in this they ^{+ 1} S. Pet. 3. are not.) But I pray, if this Company of men be infallibly ^{3.} assisted, whence is it, that this very Company have erred so dangerously, as they have, not only in some other things, but even in this Particular, by equaling the Tradition of the present Church to the written Word of God? Which is a Doctrine unknown to the || Primitive Church, and which frets upon the || S. Basil very Foundation it self, by justling with it. So belike, he that goes as far hath but half an indifferent eye, may see this Assisted Company ^{for Traditions as any. For he says: Pa-} rem vim ba- bunt ad picta- ^{ton. L. de Sp.}

Sanz. c. 27. But first, he speaks of Apostolical Tradition, not of the Tradition of the present Church. Secondly, the Learned take exceptions to this Book of S. Basil, as corrupted. Ep. Andr. Opusc. cont. Ptn. p. 9. Thirdly, S. Basil himself, Ser. de Fide, professes that he uses sometimes *Agrapha*, sed ea solia que non sunt alias à pia secunda Scripturae sententia. So he makes the Scripture their Touch-stone, or tryal. And therefore must of Necessity make Scripture superior, in as much as that which is able to try another, is of greater force, and superior Dignity in that use, than the thing tried by it. And Stapleton himself confesses, Traditionem scripturarum & posteriorum, sicut & particularum, nulo modo cum Scripturam, vel cum Traditionibus prius à se explicatis comparandam est. Stapleton. Relig. Controv. 5. q. 5. A. 2.

But A. C. would have me consider again, That it is as easie ^{NUM. 27.} ^{A. C. p. 52.} to take the Tradition of the present Church in the two fore-named senses, as the present Scriptures printed, and approved by men of this Age. For in the first sense, The very Scriptures (saith he) considered as printed, and approved by men of this Age, can be no more than of Humane Credit. But in the second sense, as printed and approved by men assisted by God's Spirit for true Copies of that which was first written, then we may give Infallible Credit to them. Well, I have considered this too. And I can take the Printing, and Approving the Copies of Holy-Writ in these two senses. And I can, and domake a difference between Copies printed and approved by mere moral men, and men assisted by Gods Spirit. And yet for the Printing only, a skilful, and an able moral man may do better service to the Church, than an illiterate man, though assisted in other things by God's Spirit. But when I have considered all this, what then? The Scripture being put in writing, is a thing visibly existent; and if any error be in the Print, 'tis easily corrigible by ^{*} former Copies. Tradition is not so easily observed,

A.C. p. 53.

ved, nor so safely kept. And howsoever, to come home to that which A. C. infers upon it, namely, *That the Tradition of the present Church may be accepted in these two senses:* And if this be all that he will infer (for his pen here is troubled, and forsakes him, whether by any check of Conscience, or no, I know not) I will, and you see, have granted it already without more ado, with this *Caution*, That every Company of men assisted by Gods Spirit, are not assisted to this height, to be *Infallible by Divine Authority*.

NUM. 28.

A.C. p. 53.

For all this A. C. will needs give a needless Proof of the *Bu-*
sinels: Namely, *That there is the Promise of Christ's, and his Ho-*
ly Spirits continual presence and assistance, S. Luke 10. 16, Mat.
 28. 19, 20. Joh. 14. 16. *not only to the Apostles, but to their*
Successors also, the lawfully sent Pastors, and Doctors of the
Church in all Ages. And *that this Promise is no less, but rather more*
expressly to them in their Preaching by word of mouth, than in
writing, or reading, or printing, or approving of Copies of what
was formerly written by the Apostles. And to all this I shall
 briefly say, *That there is a Promise of Christ's and the Holy Spi-*
rits continual presence, and assistance. I do likewise grant most
 freely, that this *Promise* is on the part of *Christ*, and the *Holy*
Ghost, most really and fully performed. But then this *Promise*
 must not be extended further than twas made. It was made
 of *Continual* presence and assistance; That I grant: and it was
 made to the *Apostles* and their *successors*; That I grant too.
 But in a *different Degree*. For it was of *Continual, and Infallible*
Assistance to the Apostles; But to their *successors*, of *Conti-*
nual and fitting assistance, but not Infallible. And therefore the
 lawfully sent *Pastors* and *Doctors* of the *Church in all Ages*,
 have had, and shall have *Continual Assistance*; but by A. C.'s
 leave, *not Infallible*, at least, not *Divine and Infallible*, either
 in writing, reading, printing, or approving Copies. And I be-
 lieve A. C. is the first, that durst affirm this: I thought he would
 have kept the *Popes Prerogative* intire, that He only might have
 been *Infallible*; and not He neither, but in *Cathedra*, sate
 down and well advised. *And well advised*: Yes, that's right.

* *Nam multe sunt Decretales heretici,*
sicut dicit Ocham. Et primitus hoc Credo,
sed non licet dogmatis esse Oppidum, quoniam
am sunt determinatae, nisi manifeste con-
fiteat, &c. Ja. Almain. in 3. Stat. D. 24. q.
unius. & Coelius. 6. Dub. 6. fin. And Al-
phon. & Caesio also both says and proves,
Calestinum Papam errare, non ut priua-
tam Personam, sed ut Papam. L. 1. adver.
Hay. c. 4. and the Glori Confess. Eam
errare posse in Q. 24. q. 1. C. A. R. illa ergo.

* But he may be safe, and not well Advised, even in *Cathedra*. And Now, shall we have all the *Lawfully sent Pastors and Do-*
ctors of that Church in all ages Infallible too? Here's a deal of *Infallibility* indeed, and yet *error* store. The truth is, the *Jesuites* have a *Moneths* mind to this *Infallibility*. And though A. C. out of his bounty is content to extend it to *all the law-*
fully sent Pastors of the Church: yet to his own *Society* questionless he means it chiefly. As did the *Apolo-*
gist

gift to whom Casaubon replies, to *Fronto Duceus*. The words of the * Apologist are : *Let day and night—life and death be joyed together, and then there will be some hope, that Heresie may fall upon the person of a Jesuite.* Yea marry, this is something indeed. Now we know where *Infallibility* is to be found. But for my present Occasion, touching the Lawfully sent Pastors of the Church, &c. I will give no other Confutation of it, then that M. Fisher and A. C. (if they be two men) are lawfully sent *Pastors and Doctors of the Church*; at least I am sure, they'll assume they are, and yet they are not *Infallible*; which I think, appears plain enough in some of their errors manifested by this Discourse, and elsewhere. Or if they do hold themselves infallible, let them speak it out, as the Apologist did.

As for the *Three Places of Scripture*, which A. C. cites, they N U M. 29. are of old alledged, and well known in this Controversie. The ^{A. C. p. 53.} First is in S. Luke 10. where Christ saith, *He that heareth you, S. Luk. 10. 16. heareth me.* This was *absolutely true* in the * *Apostles*, who kept themselves to that, which was reavealed by Christ. But it was to be but *Conditionally true* in their † *Successors*, *He that heareth you, heareth me.* That is, so long, and so || far, as you * speak my words, and not your own. For † where the Command is for Preaching, the Restraint is added. *Go (saith Christ) and teach all Nations.* But you may not preach all things what you please; but, *all things which I have commanded you.* The Publication is yours, the Doctrine is mine: And where the Doctrine is not mine, there your Publication is beyond or short of your Commission. The Second Place is in S. Mat. 28. There Christ says again, || *I am with you always unto the end of the world.* Yes; most certain it is, present by his spirit; For else in bodily presence He continued not with his Apostles, but during his abode on Earth. And this Promise of his *spiritual Presence* was to their *Successors*; else, why to the end of the World? The Apostles, did not, could not live so long. But then to

* *Nam in fide quidam Jesuitam errare non posse, atque adto est hoc unum apud suorum, ceteris, qui solent a Poëticis plati- ma commemorari, possib[us] assumendum, si nescis, mi Fratres, & p[ro]te nescire, doc- b[us] tis, ab Apologista dictus, hoc ipsum di- ficitur verba affirmant. Sic illa, cap. 3. E- jus exemplaria quod ad Scrinij. Regem fuit missum, pagina 119. Jungantur in unum, air, dies cum nocte, tembra cum luce, calidum cum frigido, sanitas cum morbo, vita cum morte: & erit cum spes aliqua posse in caput Jesuita heresin ca- dere. Ita Casaubon. Ep. ad Front. Du- ceum. Lond. 1611.*

* *Per quod docet quicquid per Santos A- postolos dicitur, acceptandum est, quia qui illos audie, Christianum audit, &c. S. Cyrilus apud Thom. in Catena. Et Domi- nus dedit apostolis suis, possidit Evan- gelium, per quas & Veritatem, id est, Dei Filium cognoscimus, &c. Quibus & dicit Dominus, Qui vos audit, &c. Irancus prefat. in L. 32. adver. Her. fin.*

† *Dicit ad Apostolos, ac per hoc ad Omnes Praepositos, qui apostolis Vicaria Ordina- tione succedunt. S. Cyprian. L. 4. Epist. 9. But S. Cyprian doth not say, that this speech of our Saviour was *equaliter dictum*, alike and equally spokēn and promised to the Apostles, and the succeeding Bishops. And I believe A. C. will not dare to say in plain and ex- press Terms, That this speech, *He that heareth you, heareth me*, doth as amply belong to every Roman Priest, as to Peter, and the Apostles. No, a great deal of Difference will become them well.*

|| *Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ, i Cor. 11. 1. and 1 Thess. 1. 6.*
* *And so Paul, Bida expressly, both for hearing the word, and for con- temning it. For neither of these (saith he) belong only to them which saw our Saviour in the flesh; but to all he- did quoque: but with this limitation; if they hear, or despise Evangelii verba: not the Preachers own. Bida in S. Luky 10. 15, 16.*

† S. Mat. 28.20. || S. Mat. 28.19, 20.

the

* Rabanus Maur. goes no farther, then that to the End some will always be in the world fit for Christ by his Spirit and Grace to inhabit : *Divina mansione & inhabitatione digni.* Rab. in S. Matth. 28, 19, 20. *Pregata habentes Dominum Protectorum, & Doorem,* saith S. Cypr. L. 4. Epist. 1. But he doth not say, *How far forth.* And, *Quocunq[ue] fidelium sicut uni corpus.* S. Chrysost. Homil. in S. Matth. And if S. Chrysostom enlarge it so far, I hope A. C. will not extend the Assistance given or promised here to the whole Body of the Faithful, to an Infallible, and Divine Assistance in every of them, as well as in the Pastors and Doctors.

+ *In illo dono quibus salus aliorum queritur (qualia sunt Propheticæ, & interpretationes Sermonum, &c.) Spiritus Sanctus nequam semper in Predicatorebus permaneat.* S. Greg. L. 2. Moral. c. 29. prin. Edit. Basil. 1551.

S. John 14-16. *Infallibility* always. The Third Place is in S. John 14, where Christ says, *The Comforter the Holy Ghost shall abide with you for ever.* Most true again. For the Holy Ghost did abide with the Apostles according to Christ's Promise there made, and shall abide with their Successors for ever, to || comfort and preserve them. But here's no Promise of Divine Infallibility made unto them.

And for that Promise which is made, and expressly of Infallibility, Saint * John 16. (though not cited by A.C.) That's confined to the Apostles only, for the settling of them in all Truth. And yet not simply all : For there are some Truths (faith + Saint Augustine) which no man's Soul can comprehend in this life. Not simply all : But || all those Truths, que non poterant portare, which they were not able to bear, when He Conversed with them. Not simply all ; but all that was necessary for the Founding, propagating, establishing, and Confirming the Christian Church. But if any man take the boldness to enlarge this Promise in the fulness of it, beyond the persons of the Apostles themselves, that will fall out which Saint + Augustine hath in a manner prophesied : Every Heretick will shelter himself, and his Vanities under this Colour of Infallible Verity.

+ Omnes vel insipientissimi Heretici, qui se Christianos vocari volunt, audaciae figmentorum suorum, quas maxime exhibet sensus humanus, hac Occasione Evangelica sententias colorare coventur, &c. S. August. T. 97. in S. Joh. circa med.

N U M. 30.
* Num. 26.
A.C. p. 52.

I told you a * little before, that A.C. his Pen was troubled, and failed him : Therefore I will help to make out his Inference for

the * Successors, the Promise goes no farther, then I am with you always ; which reaches to continual assistance, but not to Divine, and Infallible. Or if he think me mistaken, let him shew me any One Father of the Church, that extends the sense of this Place to Divine and Infallible Assistance, granted hereby to all the Apostles Successors. Sure I am, Saint + Gregory thought otherwise. For he says plainly, *That in those Gifts of God which concern other men's salvation (of which Preaching of the Gospel is One) the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Ghost doth not always abide in the Preachers, be they never so lawfully sent Pastors, or Doctors of the Church.* And if the Holy Ghost doth not always abide in the Preachers, then most certainly he doth not abide in them to a Divine

for him, that his Cause may have all the strength it can. And (as I conceive) this is that he would have. *The Tradition of the present Church is as able to work in us Divine and Infallible Faith; That the Scripture is the Word of God: As that the Bible (or Books of Scripture) now printed, and in use, is a true Copy of that, which was first written, by the Pen-men of the Holy Ghost, and delivered to the Church.* 'Tis most true, the Tradition of the present Church is alike operative, and powerful in, and over both these works: but neither *Divine*, nor *Infallible* in either. But as it is the *first moral Inducement* to persuade, that *Scripture* is the *Word of God*, so is it also the *first, but moral* still, that the *Bible we now have*, is a *true Copy* of that which was *first written*. But then as in the former, so in this latter for the *true Copy*, *The last Resolution of our Faith* cannot possibly rest upon the naked *Tradition* of the *present Church*, but must by, and with it go higher to other *Helps and Assurances*. Where I hope A. C. will confess, we have greater helps to discover the truth, or falsehood of a *Copy*, than we have means to look into a *Tradition*. Or especially to sift out this *Truth*, *That it was a Divine and Infallible Revelation*, by which the *Originals of Scripture* were *first written*: That being far more the *Subject* of this *Inquiry*, than the *Copy*, which according to *Art and Science* may be examined by former preceding *Copies* close up to the very *Apostles times*.

But A. C. hath not done yet; For in the last place he tells us, *That Tradition and Scripture, without any vicious Circle, do mutually confirm the Authority either of other.* And truly for my part, I shall easily grant him this, so he will grant me this other: Namely, *That though they do mutually, yet they do not equally confirm the Authority either of other.* For *Scripture* doth *infallibly* confirm the *Authority* of *Church-Traditions* truly so called: But *Tradition* doth but *morally* and *probably* confirm the *Authority* of the *Scripture*. And this is manifest by A. C's own Similitude: *For (faith he) tis as a King's Embassadors word of mouth, and His Kings Letters bear mutual witness to each other.* Just so indeed. For *His Kings Letters of Credence* under hand and seal, confirm the *Embassadors Authority Infallibly* to all that know Seal, and hand: But the *Embassadors word of mouth* confirms *His Kings Letters* but only *probably*. For else, Why are they called *Letters of Credence*, if they give not him more Credit, than he can give them? But that which follows I cannot approve, to wit, *That the Lawfully sent Preachers of the Gospel are Gods Legate, and the Scriptures Gods Letters, which be bath appointed his Legates to deliver, and expond.* So far 'tis well, but here's the sting: *That these Letters do warrant, that the People may bear, and give Credit to these Legates of Christ, as to Christ the King himself.*

self. Soft, this is too high a great deal. No

* Will A. C. maintain, that any Legate
2 Letter is of as great Credit, as the
Pope himself?

* Legate was ever of so great Credit as the King himself. Nor was any Priest, never so lawfully sent, ever of that Authority, that Christ himself; No sure, For ye call me Master, and Lord, and ye do well; for so I am,

S. Joh. 13.13. saith our Saviour, S. John 13. And certainly, this did not suddenly drop out of A. C's Pen. For he told us once before,

*That this Company of men which deliver the present Churches Tradition, (that is, the lawfully sent Preachers of the Church) are assisted by Gods Spirit to have in them Divine and Infallible Authority, and to be worthy of Divine and Infallible Credit, sufficient to breed in us Divine, and Infallible Faith. Why, but is it possible these men should go thus far to defend an Error, be it never so dear unto them? They as Christ? Divine, and Infallible Authority in them? Sufficient to breed in us Divine, and Infallible Faith? I have often heard some wise men say. That the Jesuite in the Church of Rome, and the Precise party in the Reformed Churches agree in many things, though they would seem most to differ. And surely this is one: For both of them differ extremely about Tradition. The one in magnifying it, and exalting it into Divine Authority; the other vilifying, and depressing it almost beneath Humane. And yet even in these different ways, both agree in this Consequent: That the Sermons and Preachings by word of mouth, of the lawfully sent Pastors and Doctors of the Church, are able to breed in us Divine and Infallible Faith. Nay, are the * very word of God. So A.C. expressly. And no less then so, have some accounted of their own factions words (to say no more) than as the † Word of God. I ever took Sermons (and so do still) to be most necessary Expositions, and Applications of Holy Scripture, and a great ordinary means of saving knowledge. But I cannot think them, or the Preachers of them Divinely Infallible. The Ancient Fathers of the Church preached far*

* For this A. C. says, expressly of Tradition, p. 52. And then he adds, That the Promise for us was no less, but rather more Expressly made to the lawfully sent Pastors and Doctors of the Church in all ages in their teaching by word of mouth, than in writing, &c.

p.53.
† For the freeing of factions and分裂 Ministers, informed, the Allowing of Gods word to its Liberty. In the Godly Author of the late News from Ipswich, p.5.

beyond any of these of either faction; And yet no one of them durst think himself Infallible, much less, that whatsoever he preached was the Word of God. And it may be Observed too, That no men are more apt to say, That all the Fathers were but Men, and might Err, than they that think their own preachings are Infallible.

The next thing (after this large Interpretation of A.C.) which I shall trouble you with, is, That this method, and manner of proving Scripture to be the Word of God, which I here use, is the same, which the Ancient Church ever held, namely, Tradition,

tion, or Ecclesiastical Authority first; and then all other Arguments, but especially internal, from the Scripture it self. This way the Church went in S. Augustine's

* Time. He was no enemy to Church-Tradition;

yet when he would prove, that the

Author of the Scripture (and so of the

whole knowledge of Divinity, as it is su-

pernatural) is *Deus in Christo*, God in

Christ; he takes this as the All-sufficient

way, and gives four proofs, all internal to

the Scripture: First, *The Miracles*. Secondly,

That there is nothing carnal in the Doctrine,

Thirdly, *That there hath been such performance of it*. Fourth-

ly, *That by such a Doctrine of Humility, the whole world almost*

hath been converted. And whereas *ad munendam Fidem*, for

the Defending of the Faith, and keeping it entire, there are

two things requisite, *Scripture*, and *Church-Tradition*;

+ *Vincent Liricensis* places *Authority of Scriptures* first, and then

Tradition. And since it is apparent, that *Tradition* is first in

order of time, it must necessarily follow, that *Scripture* is first in

order of Nature, that is, the chief, upon which Faith rests,

and resolves it self. And your own School confesses this was the

way ever. The Woman of || Samaria is a known Resemblance;

but allowed by your selves: For * *quotidie*,

daily with them that are without, Christ en-

ters by the woman, that is the Church, and

they believe by that fame which she gives,

&c. But when they come to hear Christ

himself, they believe his word, before the

words of the *Woman*. For when they have

once found Christ, + they do more believe

his words in *Scripture*, than they do the

Church, which testifies of him; because then

propter illam, for the *Scripture* they believe

the *Church*; And if the *Church* should speak

contrary to the *Scripture*, they would not be-

lieve it. Thus the School taught then;

and thus the Gloss commented then; And when

men have tired themselves, hither they must come.

The Key, that lets men in to the *Scriptures*, even to this knowledge of

them, That they are the *Word of God*, is the *Tradition of the*

Church: but when they are in, || They hear

Christ himself immediately speaking in *Script-*

ture to the Faithful: * And his Sheep do not

only hear, but know his voice. And then

here's no vicious Circle indeed of proving the *Scripture* by the

Church,

* And S. Aug. himself. L.13. contra Fa-

thrum, c. 5. proves by an Internal Ar-

gument the fulfilling of the Prophets.

Scriptura (faith he) que fidem suam

rebus ipsi probat que per temporum successiones hoc impleri, &c. And Henr. Gand.

Par. 1. Sum. A. 9. q. 3. cites S. August.

Book de vita Religione. In which Book,

though these four Arguments are not

found in Terms together, yet they fill

up the scope of the whole Book.

+ *Duplici modo maniri facilius*, &c. Pri-

mo Divinae Legis Autorita-

tate, tum deinde Ecclesie Catholicae Tradi-

tione. cont.

Hec c. I.

|| S. Joh. 4.

* Henr. 3. Gand. Sum. Par. 1. A.10.q.1.

Sic quotidie apud illos qui foris sunt, in-

trat Christus per Mulierem, i. Ecclesiam, &

credunt per illam fideant, &c. Gloss. in

S. Joh. cap. 4.

+ *Ibid. Plus verbi Christi in Scripturam credit, quam Ecclesia significavit. Quia propter illam jam credit Ecclesia. Et si ipsa quidem contraria Scriptura dicere, ipsi non credent, &c. Primam fidem tri-*

buimus Scripturis Canonica, secundam, sub

ista, Definitionibus & Consuetudinibus Ec-

clesiae Catholicae, post istas studiofis viris

non sub pena perfidia, sed prout erit, &c.

Walden. Dab. Bid. Th. 1. L. 2. Art. 2. Co.

23. N. 9.

|| *Ita acutus scripturam ipsi immediate loquuntur fidelibus* Ibid.

* S. John 10.4.

Church, and then round about, the Church by the Scripture. Only distinguish the *Times*, and the *Conditions* of men, and all is safe. For a *Beginner* in the Faith, or a *Weakling*, or a *Doubter* about it, begins at *Tradition*, and proves *Scripture* by the *Church*: But a man *strong* and *grown up* in the Faith, and understandingly conversant in the Word of God, proves the *Church* by the *Scripture*; And then upon the matter, we have a double *Divine Testimonie*, altogether Infallible, to confirm unto us, *That Scripture is the Word of God*. The first is the *Tradition* of the *Church of the Apostles* themselves, who delivered immediately to the world, the Word of *Christ*. The other, the *Scripture* it self, but after it hath received this *Testimonie*. And into these we do, and may safely Resolve our *Faith*.

* *Quod autem credimus posterioribus, circa quos non apparent virtutes Divine, hoc est, Quia non predicant alta, quam que illi in Scriptis certissimis reliquerunt. Quae consistat per medios in nullo suis virtutata ex conscientiae concordia in eorum omnium succedentium, usque ad tempora nostra. Hen. à Gand. Sum. P. I. A. 9. q. 3.*

appears by men in the middle Ages, that these writings were vitiated in nothing, by the concordant consent in them of all successors, to our own time.

NUM. 33. And now by this time it will be no hard thing to reconcile the *Fathers*, which seem to speak differently in no few places, both one from another, and the same from themselves, touching *Scripture* and *Tradition*; And that as well in this Point, to prove *Scripture* to be the Word of God, as for *concordant Exposition of Scripture* in all things else. When therefore the *Fathers* say,

† *Scripturam habemus ex Traditione.* S. Cyril. Hier. Catib. 4. *Multa que non invinatur in Litteris Apostolorum, &c. non nisi ab illis tradita & commendata creduntur.* S. Aug. 2. de Baptism. contra Donat. c. 7.

+ *We have the Scriptures by Tradition, or the like;* either They mean the *Tradition of the Apostles* themselves delivering it; and there, when it is known to be such, we may *resolve our Faith*. Or if they speak of the *Present Church*, then they mean, that the *Tradition* of it, is that by which we *first receive the Scripture*, as by an *according Means to the Prime Tradition*. But because it is not *simply Divine*, we cannot *resolve our Faith* into it, nor settle our *Faith* upon it, till it resolve it self into the *Prime Tradition of the Apostles*, or the *Scripture*, or both; and there we rest with it. And you cannot shew an ordinary consent of *Fathers*: Nay can you, or any of your Quarter, shew any one *Father* of the *Church*, *Greek*, or *Latine*, that ever said, *We are to resolve our Faith, that Scripture is the Word of God, into the Tradition of the present Church?* And again, when the *Fathers* say, we are to rely upon *Scripture*

* *only*,

* only, they are never to be understood with Exclusion of Tradition, in what causes soever it may be had, † Not but that the Scripture is abundantly sufficient, in, and to itself for all things, but because it is deep, and may be drawn into different senses, and so mistaken, if any man will presume upon his own strength, and go single without the Church.

To gather up whatsoever may seem scattered in this long Discourse to prove, *That Scripture is the Word of God*, I shall now in the Last place put all together, that so the whole state of the Question may the better appear.

First then, I shall desire the Reader to consider, that every *Prin.* 1. *Rational Science* requires some *Principles* quite without its own Limits, which are not proved in that Science, but presupposed. Thus *Rhetorick* presupposes *Grammar*, and *Musick*, *Aritmethick*. Therefore it is most reasonable that || *Theology* should be allowed to have some *Principles* also, which she proves not, but presupposes. And the chiefest of these, is, *That the Scriptures are of Divine Authority*.

cib. 5. shews how all things in the world do side confirme. Therefore most unreasonable to deny that to Divinity, which all Sciences, nay all things challenge: Namely, some things to be presupposed, and believed.

Secondly, that there is a great deal of difference in the *Man.* *Prin.* 2. *nner of confirming the Principles of Divinity*, and those of any other *Art* or *Science* whatsoever. For the *Principles* of all other *Sciences* do finally resolve, either into the *Conclusions* of some *Higher Science*; or into those *Principles* which are *per se nota*, known by their own light, and are the *Grounds* and *Principles* of all *Science*. And this is it, which properly makes them *Sciences*, because they proceed with such strength of *Demonstration*, as forces *Reason* to yeeld unto them. But the *Principles* of *Divinity* resolve not into the *Grounds* of *Natural Reason* (For then there woulde be no room for *Faith*, but all would be either *Knowledge* or *Vision*) but into the *Maximes* of *Divine Knowledge supernatural*. And of this we have just so much light, and no more, than God hath revealed unto us in the *Scripture*.

Thirdly, That though the *Evidence* of these *Supernatural Prin.* 3. *Truths*, which *Divinity* teaches, appears not so manifest as that of the *Natural*; * yet they are in themselves much more sure and in-

magis quam visibilis operet credere. Licit dictum si admirabile, virtus est, &c. S. Chrysostom. Hom. 46. ad Pop. And those he proves it. *Alio Scientie certitudinem habent ex Naturali. Lumen Rationis Humanae, que decipi potest: Hec autem ex Lumen Divinae Scientie, que decipi non potest.* Thom. p. 14. 17. 15. c.

* Non aliunde scientia Calestium. S. Hilary. L. 4. de Trinit. Si Angelus de Calo annunciat praterquam quod in Scripturis, &c. S. Aug. L. 3. cont. Petil. e. 6.
† Quam sit perfectus Scripturarum Canon, sibique ad omnia satis superque sufficiat. Cr. Vin. Lir. contra Heret. t. 2. And if it be sibi ad omnia, then to this, to prove it self, at least after Tradition hath prepared us to receive it.

|| Omnis Scientia presupponit fidem aliquam. S. Prosper. in Psalm. 123. And S. Cyril. Hierosol. Can.

fallible than they. For they proceed immediately from God, that *Heavenly Wisdom*, which being the fountain of ours, must needs infinitely precede ours, both in *Nature* and *excellence*. He

that teacheth man knowledge, shall not be know? * Psal. 94. And therefore, though we reach not the *Order* of their *Deductions*, nor can in this life come to the *vision* of them, yet we yeeld as *full* and *firm Assent*,

not only to the *Articles*, but to all the *Things* rightly deduced from them, as we do to the most evident *Principles* of *Natural Reason*. This *Assent* is called *Faith*. And *Faith* being of *things not seen*, Heb. 11. † would quite lose its honour, may it self, if it met with sufficient *Grounds* in *Natural Reason*, whereon to stay it self. For *Faith* is a mixed *Act* of the *Will* and the *Understanding*, and the || *Will* inclines the *Understanding* to yeeld *full approbation* to that whereof it sees not *full proof*. Not but that there is most *full proof* of them, but because the main *Grounds* which prove them, are concealed from our view, and folded up in the *unrevealed Counsel of God*, *God in Christ* resolving to bring mankind to their last happiness by *Faith*, and not by *knowledge*, that so the weakest among men may have their way to *blessedness* open. And certain it is, that many weak men believe themselves into *Heaven*, and many over-knowing Christians lose their way thither, while they will believe no more than they can clearly know. In which pride and vanity of theirs they are left, and have these things *hid from them*, * S. Matth. 11.

Heb. 11.1.
† Si sit Ratio
convincit, &
properam
quis credat,
aliis non cri-
ditur, tolli-
tur maritum
fidei. Biel. 3.
D. 25. q. 8 sic.
fuit. Non illi
dilectus cre-
dere, cum
judicium sub-
siguiat, aut co-
ratur. Et.
Sap. 11. phil-
ipp. 1. cor. 1.
Whittaker, cap.
6. p. 64.

¶ Fides non sit
in nobis nisi
volentibus. To-
let. in S. Job.

16. Annot. 23.

Et qui volunt, credunt. S. Aug. Sent. 6. de virt. Dom. c. 3. Fides Actus est, nos solius Intellectus, sed etiam Voluntas, quo cogi nos potest. In eis Voluntas quam Intellectus, quatenus illa operatio principium est, & Alienum (qui proprio Actu potest est) sola dicitur. Nec ab Intellectu Voluntas, sed ab Voluntate Intellectus in Actu fidei determinatur. Sap. 11. phil. 1. cor. 1. Whittak. c. 6. p. 64. Credere enim est Actus Intellectus determinatus ex nomine ex Imperio Voluntatis. Tho. 2. a. 4. 4. Actus. Nos potest dare aliquis Actus 3. Sent. D. 24. Cantic. 6. Dub. 4. And S. Aug. says: Fides locum esse cur. Tract. 52. in S. Job. Where the Heart is put for the whole Soul, which equally comprehends both the Will and the Understanding. And so doth Bisi also, in 3. Sap. D. 25. quicq. q. 1. 1. 1.

* Matth. 11. 25.

Pun. 4.

Fourthly, That the *Credit* of the *Scripture*, the *Book* in which the *Principles* of *Faith* are written, (as of other writings also) depends not upon the subservient *Inducing Cause*, that leads us to the first knowledge of the *Author*, which leader here is the *Church*; but upon the *Author* himself, and the *Opinion* we have of his sufficiencie, which here is the *Holy Spirit of God*, whose Pen-men the *Prophets* and *Apostles* were. And therefore the *Mysteries* of *Divinity* contained in this *Book*; As the *Incarnation* of our *Saviour*; The *Resurrection* of the dead, and the like, cannot finally be resolved into the sole *Testimony* of the *Church*, who is but a subservient *Cause*, to lead to the know-

knowledge of the Author, but into the Wisdom and Sufficiency of the Author, who being *Omnipotent*, and *Omniscient*, must needs be *Infallible*.

Fifthly, That the Assurance we have of the Pen-men of the *Pun. 5.* *Scriptures*, the Holy Prophets and *Apostles*, is as great, as any can be had of any Humane *Authors* of like *Antiquity*. For it is morally as evident to any Pagan, that *S. Matthew* and *S. Paul* writ the *Gospel* and *Epistles* which bear their Names, as that *Cicerio* or *Seneca* wrote theirs. But that the *Apostles* were *divinely inspired*, whilst they writ them, and that they are the *very Word of God* exprested by them, this hath ever been a matter of *Faith* in the Church, and was so, even while the *Apostles* themselves * lived, and was never a matter of *Evidence* and *Knowledge*, at least as *Knowledge* is opposed to *Faith*. Nor could it at any time then be more *Demonstratively* proved than now. I say, not *Scientifici*, not *Demonstratively*. For, were the *Apostles* living, and should they tell us, that they spake and writ the very *Oracles of God*: yet this were but *their own Testimony of themselves*, and so not alone able to enforce *Belief* on others. And for their *Miracles*, though they were *very Great Inducements of Belief*, yet were neither they *Evident*, and *Convincing Proofs*, + alone and of *themselves*. Both because There may be *counterfeit Miracles*: And because true ones are neither || *Infallible* nor *Inseparable Marks of Truth in Doctrine*. *Not Infallible*: For they may be *Marks of false Doctrine* in the highest degree.* *Deut. 13. Not proper and Inseparable: For + all*

[†] *Proprius & sic in Apostolis quoque immidiate illuminabat, causabat evidentiā. Jac. Almain. in 3. Sent. Dī. 24. q. 4. nūcā. Concl. 6.* But for the residue of men, 'tis no more, but as Thomas hath it: *Oportet quod credamus Autoritatem eorum, quibus Reputatio facta est. Thos. 1. q. 1. A. 8. ad 8.*

⁺ *Nisi ei credens vel illa esse vera miracula: vel illa fieri ad illam Veritatem comprobandum. Ja. Almain. in 3. Sent. Dī. 24. q. 4. nūcā. Concl. 6.* Therefore the *Miracles* which Christ and his *Apostles* did, were fully sufficient to beget *Faith* to *Affirm*, but not *Evidence* to *Convince*.

I *caecis nos fecit Spofus, quis & baracum scipi non debemus. 3. Aug. 7. 13. In S. Joh.* And he that says we ought not to be deceived, acknowledges that we may be deceived even by *Miracles*. And Arguments which can deceive, are not sufficient to *Convince*. Though they be sometimes too full of *eloquence* to *pervert*. And so plainly Almain, out of Ockham, *Nunquam magis credimus nisi medium probatum generaliter affirmatur, scit utram. Ja. Almai. in 3. Sent. Dī. 24. q. 4. nūcā. Concl. 6.* And therefore these Learned Roman Catholics, who tell us, the *Apostles* *Miracles* made it evident, that their *Doctrine* was *True and Divine*, went too far. *Credible* they made it, but not *Evident*. And therefore he is after forced to confess, *That the Soul sometimes affligris not to the Miracles, but in great timosity, which cannot stand with clear Evidence*. And after again, *That the Soul may remoue the Doubts formerly confirmed by Miracles, sicut sensuā et operatō Light be given, &c.* And neither can this possibly stand with *Evidence*. And therefore Bellarmine goes no further than this: *Miracula non sufficiunt. Et efficacia ad rationem suam per se admodum. L. 4. de Nbris Bish. c. 14. q. 1. To induce and persuade, but not to Convince. And Thomas will not grant so much, for he says expressly: *Miraculum non est sufficiente tam inducere Fidem. Quia credimus unum & idem miraculum, quidam crederunt, ex quidam non. Thos. 2. q. 6. A. 11. C. And Ambro. Catena. Rom. 10. 15. Is down-right at Nulla fides, est habenda fidei. Beaumanoir sent, &c. Anastasius Nicetus Epiphanius, apud Beron. ad Ans. 26 et nūcā 51. Non sicut mirifica sunt vera fidei, &c. Suarez. Disq. Fidet Cathol. L. 1. q. 7. Nam. 2. dñm dñm amigis et**

¶ Thom. 1. q. 1. 3. 2 Thes. 2. 9. S. Marc. 12. 22. + *Oportet Virtutes Misericordie & Consol. 10. (to one and another, he saith, not to all.) Demonizare, mortales inferire, &c. deinde quicquidam Discipulus sis, quicquidem servari. (That is, do Miracles.) D. Greg. Orat. 22. ac Petrus Apol. c. 5.*

which wrote by Inspiration, did not confirm their Doctrine by Miracles. For we do not find that *David* or *Solomon*, with some other of the *Prophets* did any, neither were any wrought by *S. John the Baptist*, * *S. Job. 10.* So, as *Credible Signs* they were, and are still of as much force to us, as 'tis possible for things on the credit of *Relation* to be : For the *Witnesses* are many, and such as spent their lives in making good the Truth, which they saw. But that the Workers of them were *Divinely* and *Infallibly* inspired in that which they Preacht and Writ, was

* *S. Job. 10.
41.*

|| Here it may be observed how warily *A. C.* carries himself. For when he hath said, That a clear *Revelation* was made to the *Apostles*, which is most true ; And so the *Apostles* knew that which they taught, *simpliciter & priu*iter**, most Demonstratively from the *Prime Cause*, God himself : Then he adds, p. 51. *I say, clear in itself.* That is, the *Revelation* of this Truth was clear in the *Apostles* that witnessed it. But to make it knowledge in the *Auditors*, the same, or like *Revelation*, and as clear must be made to them. For they could have no other *Knowne Assurance* ; *Credible* they might, and had. So *A. C.* is wary there, but comes not home to the *Business*, and so might have held his peace. For the *Question* is not, what clear Evidence the *Apostles* had ; but what Evidence they had, which heard them ?

* *Ezay 53. 1.*

† *Jer. 20. 7*

|| *Act. 17. 32.* And had *Zedekiah* and the people seen it as clearly as *Jesus* himself did, that the word he spake was Gods word, and Infallible, *Jerusalem*, for ought we know, had not been laid desolate by the *Chaldeans*. But because they could not see this by the way of *Knowledge*, and would not believe it by way of *Faith*, they, and that City perished together. *Jer. 36. 17.*

thought fittest to humble him at the very root of the *Tree of Knowledge*, and make him deny his understanding, and submit to *Faith*, or hazard his happiness. The *Credible Object* all the while, that is, the *Mysteries of Religion*, and the *Scripture* which contains them is *Divine* and *Infallible*, and so are the *Pen-men* of them by *Revelation*. But we, and all our Forefathers, the *Hearers* and *Readers* of them, have

nei-

neither * knowledge, nor vision of the Prime Principles in, or about them, but * Faith only. And the Revelation, which was clear to them, is not so to us, nor therefore the Prime Tradition it self delivered by them.

the Scripture, that doth not believe that it is the Word of God. I say, which doth not believe, I do not say, which doth not know. Oportet quod Credatur Authoritati eorum quibus Revelatio facta est. Tho. p. 1. q. 1. A. 8. ad secundum. 371 At lux de Christo, &c. Quod vero Animan habemus, unde manifestum? Si enim Visibilibus credere velis, & de Deo, & de Angelis, & de morte, & de Anima dubitabis: & sic tibi omnia veritatis dogmata deperibuntur. Et certe si manifestius credere velis, Invisibilium magis quam Visibilibus credere oportet. Liceat enim admirabile sit dictum, verum tamen, & apud mentem habentes valde certum, vel in corseculo. Ex homil. 13. S. Chrysost. in S. Mat. To. 1. Edit. Frontis: Paris. 1636.

Sixthly, That hence it may be gathered, that the Assent, which Pun. 6. we yeeld to this main Principle of Divinity, That the Scripture is the Word of God, is grounded upon no Compelling, or Demonstrative Ratiocination, but relies upon the strength of Faith, more than any other Principle whatsoever.

† For all other necessary Points of Divinity, may by undeniable Discourse be inferred out of Scripture it self once admitted: but this, concerning the Authority of Scripture not possibly: But must either be proved by Revelation, which is not now to be expected: Or presupposed and granted as manifest in it self, like the Principles of natural knowledge, which Reason alone will never Grant: Or by Tradition of the Church, both Prime and Present, with all other Rational Helps, preceding, or accompanying the internal Light in Scripture it self; which though it give Light enough for Faith to believe, yet Light enough it gives not to be a convincing Reason, and proof for knowledge. And this is it, which makes the very entrance into Divinity, inaccessible to those men, who standing high in the Opinion of their own wisdom, will believe nothing, but that which is irrefragably proved from Rational Principles. For as Christ requires a Denial of a mans self, that he may be able to follow him, S. Luke 9. So as great a part as any of this Denial of his Whole self (for so it must be) is the denial of his Understanding, and the composing of the unquiet search of this Grand Inquisitor into the Secrets of Him that made it, and the over-ruling the doubtfulness of it by the fervency of the || Will.

† And this is the Ground of that which I said before, §. 15. Nu. 1. That the Scripture only, and not any unwritten Tradition, was the Foundation of our Faith. Namely, when the Authority of Scripture is first yeilded unto.

Voluntatem, non per Rationem. Tho. 2. 2. q. 2. A. 1. ad tertium. And what power the Will hath in Case of mens Believing, or not Believing, is manifest, Jnt. 44. But this is spoken of the Will compared with the Understanding only, leaving the Operations of Grace free over both.

Seventhly, That the knowledge of the Supreme Cause of Pun. 7. all (which is God) is most remote, and the most difficult thing Reason can have to do with. The Quid sit, That there

Intellectus
Credens de-
terminatur per

^b *Commentarius et
nim sententia
et Patrum &
Theologorum a-
utorum, demon-
strari posse na-
turali ratione
Deum esse;
Sed & positio-
ri & per of-
ficiis. Sicut Tho.
p.1.q.2. A.2.
Et Damasc.
L.1. Orth. Pid.
G.3. & Al-
main. in 3.
sent.D.24. q.1.
But what
may be de-
monstrated
by natural
reason, by na-
tural light
may be known.
And so the
Apostle him-
self, Rom.1.
20. *Invisibili-
lia Dei & cre-
aturâ mundi
per ea que fa-*
lent & conficiuntur. And so Calvin most clearly, L.1. *Postit. c. 9. S. I. Apertis oculis nequeant, quin affi-
cere eum cogantur,* though Bellarmine would needs be girding at him, L.4. de Grat. & Lib. Arbit. cap. 2:
*Vident autem & Ratio iis que apparent atque atferi: Omnes enim homines de Diis (ut ille loquitur) habent exhibi-
tionem, Arist. L.1. de Cale. T.22;**

^c *Damasc. L.1. Orth. Pid.c.4.*

^d *1 Tim. 6. 16. Et ut Religion sic attendendi relinquit. S. Aug. nisi organa imaginatione cogitationis lu-
cen solis innumerabiliter vel quid aliquid, &c. L.8. de Vita s. 2. Solum modis accendi, Preces sunt. Boet. de
Consolat. Philos. L.5. profa.3.*

^e *Praeit Scientiam Philosophicam, necesse est ut ponatur alia Scientia divinitatis revoluta de iis que hominis
causam excedunt. Tho.p.1.q.1. A.1.*

^f And therefore *Biel* is exprest, That God could not reveal any thing that is to come, *nisi illud esset a
Deo praescitum seu previsum* (i.e. unless God did fully comprehend that which he doth reveal) *Biel* in
3. sent.D.23. q.2. A.1.

^g *Nihil Intelleximus Creatur videndo Deum, potest cognoscere Omnia que Deus facit, vel possit facere. Hor
nim est Comprehendere eum veritatem, &c. Tho.p.1.q.12. A.8.c.*

*Ad Argumentum: Quid Deus ut Speculum est: Et quod omnia que fieri possunt, id est resplendent. Respondeat
Thom. Quid non est necessarium, quod vident speculum, omnia in speculo videantur, si & speculum non fuisset compre-
hendens. Tho.p.1.q.12. A.8. ad 2. (Now no man can comprehend this Glass which is God Himself.)*

^h *Deus enim est Speculum voluntariorum revulans quod est quod vult alieni blato: non est Speculum naturae sed re-
presentans omnia. Biel. Suppl. in 4. Sent.D.49. q.3. p.190.6.*

ⁱ For if Reason well put to its search did not find this out, how came *Arist.* to affirm this by rational
disquisition? *Autem enim videtur, sic. Reth. ut mentis sola extirpatione accidit, eaque sola divina sit, sicut
exim cum eius Actione communicaat Actio corporalis. Arist. L.2. de gen. Anim. c. 3.* This cannot be spoken of the
Soul, were it mortal. And therefore I must needs be of *P. Augustinus* his opinion, who says plainly, and
proves it too, *Tertius affixam à quibusdam Aristoteli mortalitatis Animae Opinionem. Benius in Timaeo
Platoni. Decad. 24. L.2.*

^k For if Reason did not dictate this also, whence is it that *Aristotele* disputes of the way and means of
attaining it? *L.1. Moral. c.9.* And takes on him to prove, That Felicity is rather an Honourable than a
Commendable thing, *c.12.* And after all this, he adds, *Deus blata vita est, hominibus autem tamen,
quatenus similitudo quadam eiusmodi Operationis ipsis inest, Arist. L.10. Moral.c.8.*

^l *S. John 17. 3. Ultima Beatitude homini conficit in quadam supernaturali visione Dei. Ad hanc autem
visionem Homo præparare non potest, nisi per medium Adiutorium à Deo Doctor. Omnis qui audit à Patre & di-
citur. S. John 5.45. Thom. 2.2. q.2. A.3. p.6.*

^{*} *Deus & Natura utilissima factum, Arist. L.1. de Cale. T.33. Frustra autem est quod non possit habi-
re suum usum, Thom. 2.2. q.2. A.3. p.6.*

once grant me that *Revelation* is necessary, and then I will appeal to Reason it self, and that shall prove abundantly one of these two : That either, there was never any such *Revelation* of this kind from the worlds beginning to this day ; And that will put the frustrā upon God in point of mans Felicitie : Or, that the *Scriptures* which we now embrace, as the Word of God, is that *Revelation* ; And that's it we Christians labour to make good against all *Atheism*, *Prophaneness*, and *Infidelity*.

Last of all, To prove that the *Book of God* which we honour as His Word, is this necessary *Revelation* of God and his Truth, which must, and is alone able, to lead us in the way to our eternal Blessedness (or else the world hath none) comes in a *Cloud of witnessess*. Some for the *Insidel*, and some for the *Believer*. Some for the *Weak in Faith*, and some for the *Strong*. And some for *all*. For then first comes in the *Tradition of the Church*, the present *Church* ; so 'tis no *Heretical*, or *Schismatical Belief*. Then the *Testimony of former Ages* ; so 'tis no *New Belief*. Then the *consent of Times* ; so 'tis no *Divided or partial Belief*. Then the *Harmony of the Prophets*, and them fulfilled ; so 'tis not a * *Devised*, but a *forespoken Belief*. Then the success of the *Doctrine* contained in this *Book* ; so 'tis not a Belief *stifled in the Cradle* ; but it hath spread through the world in despite of what the world could do against it ; And increased from weak, and unlikely Beginnings, to incredible Greatness. Then the *Confancie of this Truth* ; so 'tis no *Moon-Belief* : For in the midst of the worlds Changes, it hath preserved its *Creed* entire through many generations. Then, that there is nothing *Carnal in the Doctrine* ; so 'tis a *Chaste Belief*. And all along it hath gained, kept, and exercised more power upon the minds of men, both learned and unlearned, in the increase of virtue, and repression of vice, than any *Moral Philosophy*, or *Legal Policie* that ever was. Then comes the *ward Light and Excellencie of the Text it self* ; and so 'tis no dark, or dazzling Belief. And 'tis an *Excellent Text* : For see the riches of *Natural knowledge*, which are stored up there, as well as *Supernatural*. Consider how things quite above Reason consent with things Reasonable. Weigh it well what *Majesty* lies there hid under *Humility*: * What *Depth* there is with a *perspicuity unimitable* : What † *Delight* it works in the *Soul*, that is devoutly exercised in it, how the || *Sublimis* will find in it enough to amaze them ; while the || *Simplex* want not enough to direct them. And then we shall not wonder, if

* Qua^zqui
dam forsus
est, plaus, &
alius, in quo
& agere am-
bulet, & El-
phas asset,
if S. Greg. Pra-
fatis Lib.
Moralium. 5. 4.

† In Legi Domini voluntate eius, Psal. 1. a. Dulcior super misericordiam, Psal. 10. 11. et passim.
|| Multa dicuntur submissis & buxi repentibus animis, ut accommodatim per humanam in Divina consurgant.
Multum etiam figurant, ut studio mens, & questra exercitatio utilitas, & mortale letorum inveniant. S. Aug. de
Mor. Eccl. Cat. 6. 17. Sed nihil sub spiritu Christi continetur, sed illi manifestatur, quod Scriptura per Literalem
sententiam aliquid manifeste non tradat. Tho. p. 1. q. 1. A. 10. ad 1.

* Credimus, &c. scit ab alia multa corr.
tiora Argumenta & quatuor Testimoniorum
Ecclie & tum propter hoc potissimum, quia
Spiritus Sanctus nolis iniurias eis. De
voce persuadet. Whistler. Disput. de
Sac. Script. Communione. 1. 43. 5. 8.

† Gal. 1. 8. this Truth : such, as that, † Though an Angel from Heaven should Preach unto us another Gospel, we would not believe Him, or it. No ; though we should see as great, and as many Miracles done over again to dissuade us from it, as were at first to win the world to it. To which firmness of Assent by the Operation of Gods Spirit, the Will confers as much, or more strength, than the Understanding, Clearness, the whole Assent being an Act of Faith, and not of Knowledge. And therefore the Question should not have been asked of me by P. How I knew ? But, upon what Motives I did believe Scripture to be the word of God ? And I would have him take heed, lest hunting too close after a way of Knowledge, he lose the way of Faith, and teach other men to lose it too.

PUN. 9. So then the Way lies thus (as far as it appears to me) The Credit of Scripture to be Divine Resolves finally into that Faith, which we have touching God Himself, and in the same order. For as that, so this hath Three main Grounds, to which all other are Reducible. The first is, the Tradition of the Church : And this leads us to a Reverend persuyasion of it. The second is, The Light of Nature : and this shews us how necessary such a Revealed Learning is, and that no other way it can be

¶ cum Fidei infallibili veritati initia-
tur : Et idem cum impossibile sit de veris di-
monstrari Contraria & impo-
sitiones que contra fidem tradicionem, non
possunt esse Demonstratae, sed solubilia Ar-
gumenta. Thos. 1. q. d. 1. a. c.

* Fidei ultima Regula est in Deo illu-
minacion. S. Aug. cont. Paul. 1. 14.

(with the assistance of * Gods Spirit, who alone works Faith and Belief of the Scriptures, and their Divine Authority, as well as other Articles) we grow up into a most Infallible Assurance, such an Assurance, as hath made many lay down their lives for

the Truth. And therefore the Question should not have been asked of me by P. How I knew ? But, upon what Motives I did believe Scripture to be the word of God ? And I would have him take heed, lest hunting too close after a way of Knowledge, he lose the way of Faith, and teach other men to lose it too.

So then the Way lies thus (as far as it appears to me) The Credit of Scripture to be Divine Resolves finally into that Faith, which we have touching God Himself, and in the same order. For as that, so this hath Three main Grounds, to which all other are Reducible. The first is, the Tradition of the Church : And this leads us to a Reverend persuyasion of it. The second is, The Light of the Text it self ; in Converging wherewith we meet with the * spirit of God inwardly inclining our hearts, and sealing the full Assurance of the sufficiencie of all Three unto us. And then, and not before, we are certain, That the Scripture is the Word of God both by Divine, and by Infallible Proof. But our Certainty is by Faith, and so voluntary, not by Knowledge of such Principles, as in the light of Nature can enforce Assent whether we will or no.

I have said thus much upon this great Occasion, because this Argument is so much pressed, without due respect to Scripture. And I have proceeded in a Synthetical way, to build up the Truth for the benefit of the Church, and the satisfaction of all men Christianly disposed. Whereas had I desired only to rid my hands of these Captious Jesuites (for certainly this Question was Captiously alked ;) it had been sufficient to have re-

stored

stored the *Question*, thus : How do you know the *Testimony* of the Church (by which, you say, you know *Scripture* to be the *Word of God*) to be *Divine* and *Infallible* ? If they prove it by *Scripture* (as all of them do, and as A.C. doth) how do they know that *Scripture* to be *Scripture* ? It is but a *Circular Assurance* of theirs, by which they found the *Churches Infallibility* upon the *Testimony of the Scripture*; And the *Scriptures Infallibility* upon the *Testimony of the Church*: That is upon the Matter, the *Churches Infallibility* upon the *Churches Infallibility*. But I labour for edification, not for destruction. And now, by what I have here said, I will weigh my *Answer*, and his *Exception* taken against it.

F. *The Bishop said, That the Books of Scripture are Principles to be Supposed, and needed not to be Proved.*

B. Why, but did I say, That this Principle (*The Books of Scripture are the Word of God*) is to be supposed, as needing no Proof at all to a *Natural man*? Or to a *man newly entring upon the Faith*? yea, or perhaps to a *Doubter*, or *Weakling* in the *Faith*? Can you think me so weak? It seems you do. But sure I know, there is a great deal of difference between *Ethicks* that deny, and deride the *Scripture*, and men that are Born in the *Church*. The first have a farther way about to this *Principle*; The other in their very *Christian Education* suck it in, and are taught so soon as they are apt to learn it, *That the Books*, commonly called *The Bible*, or *Scripture*, are the *Word of God*. And I dealt with you^{*} as with a *Christian*, though in *Error*, while you call *Catholike*. The Words before spoken by me were, *That the Scripture only, not any unwritten Tradition, was the Foundation of Faith*. The *Question* between us, and you is, *Whether the Scripture do contain all necessary things of Faith?* Now in this *Question*, as in all *Nature* and *Art*, the *Subject*, the *Scripture* is and must be[†] supposed. The *Quare* between the *Roman-Catholicks* and the *Church of England*, being only of the *Predicate*, the thing uttered of it, Namely, Whether it contain all *Fundamentals of Faith, all Necessaries for Salvation within it?* Now since the *Question* proposed in very form of *Art*, proves not, but || supposes the *Subject*, I think I gave a satisfying *Answer*. That to you, and me, and in this *Question*, *Scripture* was a *Supposed Principle*, and needed no Proof. And I must tell you, that in this *Question* of the *Scriptures perfect Continent*, it is against all *Art*, yea and *Equity*, too, in Reasoning to call for a proof of That here, which must go unavoidably *supposed* in this *Question*. And if any man

* Dixi sic ut congruerat ad quem scripsit. 1.1. Rer. Aug. 1.13. M. M. M.

† Nor is it such a strange thing to hear that *Scripture* is such a *Suppos'd Principle* among Christians. Quia & Scriptura evidenter dicitur, sic evidenter verum, suppositis Scripturis. Bellarm. L. 4. de Ecc. Milit. q. 8. s. 3.

|| De *Subjecto* tamen queritur semper, non *Subiectum ipsius*.

* L. 4. de verb.
Dei, c. 4. S.
P. 2. et
tunc et. And
the Jesuit
here, quod
A.C. p. 49.

will be so familiar with Impiety, to Question it, it must be tried in a preceding Question, and Dispute by it self. Yet here not you only, but ^{*} Bellarmine, and others run quite out of the way to scratch at Advantage.

F. Against this I read what I had formerly written in my Reply against M. John White : Wherein I plainly shew'd, that this Answer was not good, and that no other Answer could be made, but by admitting some Word of God unwritten, to assure us of this Point.

§. 18.

NUM. 1.

B. Indeed here you read out of a Book (which you called your own) a large Discourse upon this Argument. But surely I so untied the knot of the Argument, that I set you to your Book again. For your self confess, that against this you read what you had formerly written. Well ! what ere you read there, certain it is you do a great deal of wrong to M. Hooker[†], and my self, that because we call it a Supposed or Presumed Principle among Christians, you should fall by and by into such a || Metaphysical Discourse to prove, That that which is a || Precognition, fore-known in Science, must be of such light, that it must be known of, and by it self alone ; and that the Scripture cannot be so known to be the Word of God.

¶ L. 3. 5. 8.
† Whereas
Bellm. says
expressly, that
in the Con-
troveries be-
tween you
and us, Ne
quid de Me-
taphysica sub-
stitutibile, que
fuit pericula ignorari, & incertum cum laude appugnari posset, &c. Bellarm. Praefat. Operib. prefz.
S. 3.

|| His omnibus Quæstiōnibus præmissis ut Controversia in Verbo Dei. Nisi enim disputari posset, nisi prius in aliquo Communis Principio cum Adversario concordium. Convenit tamen inter nos & omnes omnia Heretici, Verbum Dei esse Regulum fidei, ex qua de Dogmatibus indicandum sit, est Communis Principio ad omnibus concordum, unde Argumentum discatur, &c. Bellarm. Praefat. Operib. prefz. S. ult. And if it be common Principle as omnibus concordum, then I hope it may be taken as a thing supposed, or as a Prescognition in this Dispute between us.

NUM. 2.

I will not now enter again into that Discourse, having said enough already, how far the *Beam*, which is very glorious (especially in some parts of Scripture) gives *light* to prove it self. You see neither Hooker, nor I, nor the Church of England (for ought I know) leave the *Scripture* alone to manifest it self, by the light, which it hath in it self. No ; but when the present Church hath prepared, and led the way, like a preparing Morning-Light to Sun-shine ; then indeed we settle for our Direction, yet not upon the first opening of the morning-light, but upon the Sun it self. Nor will I make needless enquiry, how far, and in what manner a *Precognition*, or *Supposed Principle* in any *Science*, may be proved in a *Higher*, to which that is subordinate ; or accepted for a *Prime*. Nor how it may in Divinity, where *Pre*, as well as *Post*-cognit, things fore, as well as after-known, are matters, and under the manner of *Faith*, and not of *Science* strictly. Nor whether a *Precognition*

tum, a presupposed Principle in Faith, which rests upon *Divine Authority*, must needs have as much, and equal Light to Natural Reason, as Prime Principles have in Nature, while they rest upon Reason. Nor whether it may justly be denied to have sufficient Light, because not equal. Your

own School * grants, That in us, which are the Subjects both of Faith and Knowledge, and in regard of the Evidence given in unto

* Collyer's spirit ex Tho. p. 1. q. 1. Arg: ad 1. Et articulatum Evidet veritas non pars unius esse evidens absolute. Bellar. L. 4. ad 3. Art. 3. S. 3.

us, there is less Light, less Evidence in the Principles of Faith, than in the Principles of Knowledge, upon which there can be no doubt. But I think the School will never grant, That the Principles of Faith (even this in Question) have not sufficient Evidence. And you ought not to do, as you did, without any Distinction, or any Limitation, deny a *Præcognitum*, or Prime Principle in the Faith; because it answers not in all things to the Prime Principles in Science, in their Light and Evidence; a thing in it self directly against Reason.

Well, though I do none of this, yet first I must tell you that N U M. 3.

A.C. here steps in again, and tells me, That though a *Præcognitum* in Faith need not be so clearly known, as a *Præcognitum* in Science, yet there must be this proportion between them, that, whether it be in Science, or in Faith, the *Præcognitum*, or thing supposed as known, must be *prīus cognitum*, first known, and not need another thing pertaining to that Faith, or Knowledge, to be known before it. But the Scripture (faith he) needs Tradition to go before it, and introduce the knowledge of it. Therefore the Scripture is not to be supposed, as a *Præcognitum*, and a thing fore-known. Truly I am sorry to see in a man very learned such wilful mistakes. For A.C. cannot but perceive by that which I have clearly laid down before, That I intended not to speak precisely of a *Præcognitum* in this Argument. But when I said, Scriptures were Principles to be supposed; I did not, I could not intend, they were *prīus cognite*, known before Tradition; since I confess every where, That Tradition introduces the knowledge of them. But my mean-

ing is plain; That the Scriptures are and must be Principles supposed, before you can dispute this Question; || Whether the Scriptures contain in them all things necessary to salvation. Before which Question it must necessarily be supposed and granted on both sides, That the Scriptures are the Word of God. For if they be not, 'tis instantly out of all Question, that They cannot include all Necessaries to Salvation. So 'tis a *Præcognitum*, not to Tradition (as A.C. would

I. And my immediate Words, in the Conference, upon which we jointly agreed. Else I carry Scepticism to be Scripture; were (as the saying himself declares it, and A.C. doth) That the Scripture only, not any unwritten Tradition, was the Foundation of our Faith. Now the Scripture cannot be the sole Foundation of Faith, if it contain not all things necessary to salvation; Which the Church of Rome stonying against all Antiquity, makes it now become a Question, And to reason of this my Answer was, That the Scripture are, and must be Principles supposed, before the handling of this Question.

cunningly put upon the Cause) but to the whole Question of the *Scriptures sufficiencie*. And yet if he could tie me to a *Præcognitum* in this very Question, and proveable in a Superior Science; I think I shall go very near to prove it in the next Paragraph, and intreat A. C. to confess it too.

NUM. 4.

And now having told A. C. this, I must secondly follow him a little farther. For I would fain make it appear as plainly, as in such a difficulty it can be made, what wrong he doth *Truth* and *himself* in this Case. And it is the common fault of them all. For when the *Protestants* answer to this *Argument* (which, as I have shew'd, can properly have no place in the Question between us about *Tradition*) + they which grant this as a *Præcognitum*, a thing fore-known (as also I do) were neither *ignorant*, nor *forgetful*. That things presupposed, as already known in a Science, are of two sorts. For either they are plain and fully manifest in their own Light: or they are proved and granted already, some former knowledge having made them Evident. This Principle then, *The Scriptures are the Oracles of God*, we cannot say is clear, and fully manifest to all men simply, and in *Self-Light*, for the Reasons before given. Yet we say, after *Tradition* hath been our *Introduction*, the Soul that hath but ordinary *Grace* added to *Reason*, may discern *Light* sufficient to resolve our *Faith*, that the *Sun* is there. This Principle then being not absolutely, and simply evident in it self, is presumed to be taught us otherwise. And if otherwise, then it must be taught in and by some *superior Science*, to which *Theology* is subordinate. Now men may be apt to think out of Reverence, That *Divinity* can have no Science above it. But your own

* *Hoc modo
Sacra Doctrina est Scien-
tia; quia pro-
cedit ex Prin-
cipiis ex Li-
mum superiori
Scientia, que
scilicet ex
Scientia Dei
& Beatorum.*

* *The sacred Doctrine of Di-
vinity in this sort is a Science, because it proceeds out of Prin-
ciples that are known by the light of a Superior Knowledge,
which is the Knowledge of God, and the Blessed in Heaven. In
this Superior Science, This Principle, *The Scriptures are the O-
racles of God*, is more than evident in full light. This Super-
ior Science delivered this Principle in full revealed Light to*

*Thos. p. 1. q. 1. a. 2. And what says A. C. now to this of Aquinas? It is not clear in him, that this Principle, *The Scriptures are the word of God, of Divine, and most infallible, Credit*, is a *Præcognitum* in the knowledge of *Divinity*, and proveable in a superior Science, namely, the *Knowledge of God, and the Blessed in Heaven?* Yet is so clear, that (as I told you he would) A. C. confesses it, p. 51. But he adds: *Item hoc non ordinariam fuit iste Proefit, therefore we must go higher to Christ, who saw it clearly. Quod si to the Apostles, to whom it was clearly revealed; or to them, who by Succession received it from the divine source.* So now, because Christ is ascended, and the Apostles gone into the number of the *Ecclesia*, and made in a higher Degree partakers of their knowledge; therefore we must now only go unto *their Successors*, and borrow light from the *Tradition of the present Church*. For that we must do; And must do well. But that we must rely upon that *Tradition, as Divisa, and Infallibilis, and able to breed it in Divisa, and Infallibilem*, as A. C. adds, p. 51, 52, is a Proposition, which in the times of the *Priuilegia Ecclesiæ* would have been accounted very dangerous, as indeed it is. For I would fain know, why bearing too much upon *Tradition* may not mislead Christians, as well as it did the Jews. But they *think* so. *Traditionem suam* *Lxx* *proponit Transgraft post Cap. 14. in S. Mat.* Yet to this *they* are *of late* now grown, that *the Traditions of the present Church are infallibilis*: And by *outreaching* *the Truth*, lead many after them. And as it is yet. p. 51. *The Prophets prophetic intreats, and the Prophetic gifts, and my people diligent omittit, what will become of this in the end?**

the Prophets and Apostles. * This Infallible Light of this Principle made their Authority derivative Divine. By the same Divine Authority they wrote, and delivered the Scripture to the Church. Therefore from them immediately the Church received the Scripture, and that uncorrupt, though not in the same clearness of Light, which they had. And yet since no sufficient Reason hath, or can be given, that in any Substantial thing it hath been * Corrupted, it remains firm at this day, and that proved in the most Supreme Science; and therefore now to be supposed (at least by all Christians) That the Scripture is the Word of God. So; my Answer is good, even in strictness, That this Principle is to be supposed in this Dispute.

* Non credam Deum esse Author hujus Scientie, autem homines hoc testati sunt in quantum clamnes modo Testimonio Humanorum; sed in quantum circa eos confitetur virtus Divinitatis. Et iste Deus iste, & p[ro]p[ter]is in eis Testimonium peribuit. Hen. 2. Gand. Sum. P. I. A. 9. q. 3.

tulliorum collatione confutatur. Maximè, quia non una lingua, sed multis contingit Scriptura. Nonnulli autem Codicibus mendicatis, vel de Antiquoribus, vel de Linguis praecedente imparantur. S. Aug. L. 32. com. Faustini, c. 16.

Besides, the Jews never had, nor can have any other Proof, N U M. 5. That the Old Testament is the Word of God, than we have of the New. For theirs was delivered by Moses, and the Prophets; and ours was delivered by the Apostles, which were Prophets too. The Jews did believe their Scripture by a Divine Authority: For so the Jews argue themselves:

* S. Job. 9. We know that God spake with Moses. + And therefore they could no more err in following Moses, than they could in following God himself. And our Saviour seems to infer as much, || S. Job. 5. || S. Joh. 5.47.

* S. John 9. 29.

+ Maldonat. in S. Joh. 9. Itaque non magis errare posse cum sequentes, quam si Deum ipsum sequentur.

where he expostulates with the Jews thus: If you believe not Moses his Writings, how shouldest you believe Me? Now how did the Jews know that God spake to Moses? How? Why apparently, the same way that is before set down. First, by Tradition. So S. Chrysostome: We know why: By whose witness do you know? By the Testimony of our Ancestors. But he speaks not of their immediate Ancestors, but their Prophets, which were Prophets, and whose Testimony was Divine; into which (namely their Writings) the Jews did resolve their Faith. And even that Scripture of the Old Testament was a Light, and a shining Light too: And therefore could not but be sufficient, when Tradition had gone before. And yet though the Jews entred this way to their Belief of the Scripture, they do not say, || Audivimus, We have heard that God spake to Moses, but We know it. So they Resolved their Faith higher, and into a more inward Principle, than an Ear to their immediate Ancestors, and their Tradition. And I would willingly learn of you,

* Hom. 57. in S. Joh. 9.

+ S. Pet. 1. 19.

|| S. Chrysostome supra.

¶ in manu scriptorij.

quod est manus scriptorij.

¶ in manus scriptorij.

you, if you can shew it me, where ever any one Jew disputing with another about their *Law*, did put the other to prove, that the *Old Testament* was the *Word of God*. But they still supposed it. And when others put them to their *Proof*, this way they went. And yet you say:

F. That no other Answer could be made, but by admitting some *Word of God unwritten*, to assure us of this Point.

B. I think, I have shewed, that my *Answer is good*, and that no other Answer need be made. If there were need, I make no Question, but another Answer might be made to assure us of this Point, though we did not admit of any *Word of God unwritten*. I say, to assure us; and you express no more. If you had said, to assure us by *Divine Faith*, your Argument had been the stronger. But if you speak of *Affurance* only in the general, I must then tell you (and it is the great advantage which the *Church of Christ* hath against *Insidels*) a man may be assured, nay infallibly assured by *Ecclesiastical* and *Humane Proof*. Men that never saw *Rome*, may be sure, and infallibly believe, That such a *city* there is, by *Historical*, and *acquired Faith*. And if *Consent of Humane Story* can assure me this, why should not *Consent of Church-story* assure me the other, That *Christ and his Apostles delivered this Body of Scripture as the Oracles of God*? For *Jews, Enemies to Christ*, they bear witness to the *Old Testament*; and *Christians* through almost all

* Tantum bonum, & temporam censuram firmatum. S. Aug. L. de Mor. Eccles. Cap. c. 29. *Si Libri quoque modesti habent fassilli tam Divinarum Rerum pleni propterea generis humani confessione diffamantur, &c.* S. Aug. diu. 1. Cred. c. 7. & L. 13. cont. Fanf. c. 15.

† Super omnes
omnium Gen-
tium Literas.
S. Aug. 11. de
Civit. Dei, 6. 1.

Testimony which it receives, above all † *Writings of all Nations*; so here is assurance in a great measure, without any *Divine Authority*, in a Word written or Unwritten. A great assurance, and it is Infallible too; Only then we must distinguish *Infallibility*. For first, a thing may be presented as an *infallible Object of Belief*, when it is true, and remains so. For Truth *qua talis*, as it is Truth, cannot deceive. Secondly, a thing is said to be *Infallible*, when it is not only true, and remains so, actually, but when it is of such invariable constancy, and upon such ground, as that no Degree of falsehood at any time, in any respect can fall upon it. Certain it is, that by *Humane Authority, Consent, and Proof*, a man may be assured *infallibly*, that the *Scripture is the Word of God*, by an *acquired*

quired Habit of Faith, *cui non subest falsum*, under which nor Error, nor falsehood is: But he cannot be assured *infallibly*, by Divine Faith, * *cui subesse non potest falsum*, into which no falshood can come, but by a Divine Testimony: This Testimony is absolute in Scripture it self, delivered by the *Apostles* for the Word of God, and so sealed to our Souls by the operation of the *Holy Ghost*. That which makes way for this as an + *Introduction* and outward motive, is the *Tradition of the present Church*; but that neither simply Divine, nor sufficient alone, into which we may resolve our *Faith*, but only as is || before expressed.

And now to come close to the Particular. The time was, N U M. 2: before this miserable Rent in the Church of Christ (which I think no true Christian can look upon, but with a bleeding heart) that you and We were all of *One Belief*: That belief was tainted, in tract and corruption of times, very deeply. A Division was made; yet so, that both *Parts* held the *Creed*, and other Common Principles of Belief. Of these, this was one of the greatest, * *That the Scripture is the Word of God*; + *Inter omnes penitentias confitatur*, that our belief of all things contained in it, depends upon it. Since this Division, there hath been nothing done by us to discredit this Principle. Nay, We have given it all honour, and ascribed unto it more sufficiencie, even to the containing of all things necessary to salvation, with + *Satis superque*, enough and more than enough; which your selves have not done, do not. And for begetting and settling a Belief of this Principle, we go the same way with you, and a better besides. *The same way with you*: Because we allow the *Tradition* of the present Church to be the first inducing Motive to embrace this Principle; only we cannot go so far in this way as you, to make the present *Tradition* always an *Infallible Word of God unwritten*: For this is to go so far in, till you be out of the way. For *Tradition* is but a Lane in the Church; it hath an end, not only to receive us in, but another after, to let us out, into more open, and richer ground. *And we go a better way than you*: Because after we are moved, and prepared, and induced by *Tradition*, we resolve our Faith into that Written Word, and God delivering it; in which we find *materially*, though not in Terms, the very *Tradition*, that led us thither. And so we are sure by Divine Authority that we are in the way, because at the end we find the way proved. And do what can be done, you can never settle the Faith of man about this great Principle, till you rise to greater assurance, than the Present Church alone can give. And therefore once again to that known place of S. Augustine: * The words of the Father are, *Nisi commoveret, Un- less the Authority of the Church moved me*: but not alone, but with other Motives; else it were not *commovere*, to move together.

gether. And the other Motives are *Resolvers*, though this be Leader. Now since we go the *same way* with you, so far as you go *right*; and a *better way* than you, where you go *wrong*; we need not admit any other Word of God, than we do. And this ought to remain, as a *Presupposed Principle* among all Christians, and not so much as come into this *Question*, about the sufficiencie of *Scripture* between you, and us. But you say, that

F. From this the Lady called us, and desiring to hear, Whether the Bishop would grant the Roman Church to be the Right Church? The B. granted, That it was.

§. 20.

NUM. 1.
* Pamell. in
Summar. Lib-
vidus Dispu-
tationibus xi-
bil aut pann
profici.

† Acts 6.9.

|| Acts 9.29.

* Acts 19.17.

B. One occasion which moved Tertullian to write his Book *de Prescript. adversus Hereticos*, was, That he * saw little or no Profit come by *Disputations*. Sure the Ground was the same then, and now. It was not to deny, that *Disputation* is an Opening of the Understanding, a lifting out of Truth; it was not to affirm, that any such *Disquisition* is in, and of it self unprofitable. If it had, S. Stephen † would not have disputed with the Cyrenians, nor S. Paul with the || Grecians first,

and then with the Jews *, and all Comers. No sure: it was some Abuse in the *Disputants*, that frustrated the good of the *Disputation*. And one Abuse in the *Disputants*, is a *Resolution to hold their own*, though it be by unworthy means, and disparagement † of truth. And so I find it here.

For as it is true, that this *Question* was asked; so it is altogether false, that it was asked in this || form, or so answered. There is a great deal of Difference (especially as *Romanists* handle the *Quetion of the Church*) between *The Church*, and *A Church*; and there is some between a *True Church* and a *Right Church*: which is the word you use, but no man else that I know; I am sure not I.

NUM. 2.

For *The Church* may import, in our Language, *The only true Church*; and perhaps (as some of you seem to make it) *the Root and the Ground of the Catholike*. And this I never did grant of the *Roman Church*, nor ever mean to do. But *A Church* can imply no more, than that it is a *member of the Whole*. And this I never did, nor ever will deny, if it fall not absolutely away from *Christ*. That it is a *True Church* I granted also; but not a *Right* (as you impose upon me.) For *Ens* and *Verum*, *Being* and *True*, are convertible one with another; and every thing that hath a *Being*, is truly *that Being*, which it is, in *truth of Substance*. But this word *Right* is not so used, but is referr'd more properly to *perfection in Conditions*: And in this sense, every

every thing that hath a true, and real *Being*, is not by and by *Right* in the *Conditions* of it. A man that is most dishonest, and unworthy the name, a very *Thief* (if you will) is a *True man*, in the *verity* of his *Essence*, as he is a *Creature endued with Reason*; for this none can steal from him, nor he from himself, but *Death*: But he is not therefore a *Right*, or an *upright man*. And a *Church* that is exceeding corrupt, both in *Manners* and *Doctrine*, and so a dishonour to the Name, is yet a *True Church* in the *verity* of *Essence*, as a *Church* is a *Company* of men, which profess the *Faith of Christ*, and are Baptized into his Name: But yet it is not therefore a *Right Church*, either in *Doctrine*, or *Manners*. It may be you meant cunningly to slip in this word *Right*, that I might at unawares grant it *Orthodox*. But I was not so to be caught; For I know well, that *Orthodox Christians* are keepers of *integrity*, and followers of right * *Integritatis*
things (*sq. St. Augustine*) of which, the *Church of Rome* at *cultus, &*
this day is neither. In this sense then no *Right*, that is, no *Orthodox* *De vera Relig.*
Church at Rome. *c. 5.*

And yet no News it is, that I granted the *Roman Church* to N U M. 3. to be a *True Church*. For so much very learned Protestants † have acknowledged before me; and the *Truth* cannot deny it. For that *Church*, which receives the *Scripture* as a Rule of *Faith*, though but as a partial and imperfect Rule; and both the *Sacraments* as Instrumental Causes, and Seals of *Grace*, though they add more, and misuse these; yet cannot but be a *True Church in essence*. How it is in *Manners* and *Doctrine*, I would you would look to it with a single eye, || For if Piety and a Peaceable mind be not joyned to a good understanding, nothing can be known in these great things.

ut accidat, fin quā de sanctis ribus sibi prosum intelligi potest. S. Aug. ad Mil. Cred. c. 18.

Here A. C. tells us, That the *Jesuite* doth not say that the *Lady* N U M. 4. asked this Question in this, or any other precise form of words; But saith, the *Jesuite* is sure, her desire was to know of me, whether I would grant the *Roman Church* to be the right *Church*? And how was the *Jesuite* sure the *Lady* desired to hear this from me? Why, A. C. tells us that too. For he adds, That the A. C. p. 54. *Jesuite* had particularly spoken with her before, and willed her to insist upon that Point. Where you may see, and tis fit the Clergy of England should consider with what cunning Adversaries they have to deal, who can find a way to * prepare their Disciples, and instruct them before-hand upon what Points to in- * And after gain, p. 54.
that the *Lady* did not ask the Question, as if she meant to be satisfied with hearing what I said. So belike they take Caution before-hand for that too. That whatever we say (unless we grant what they would have) their Proselytes shall not be satisfied with it.

A.C. p. 54.

* 5.20. N. 1.

sist, that so they may with more ease slide that into their hearts
and *consciencies*, which should never come there. And this
once known, I hope they will the better provide against it. But
A. C. goes on, and tells us, *That certainly by my Answer, the
Ladies desire must needs be, to bear from me, not whether the
Church of Rome were a right Church, &c. but whether I would
grant, that there is but one holy Catholike Church, and whether
the Roman Church (that is, not only that which is in the City,
or Diocese of Rome, but all that agreed with it) be not it. About
it Church, and The Church, I have said enough * before,
and shall not repeat. Nor is there any need I should. For A.
C. would have it *The Church, The One, Holy, Catholike Church*.
But this cannot be granted, take the *Roman Church*, in what
sense they please, in *City*, or *Diocese*, or all that agree with it.
Yet howsoever before I leave this, I must acquaint the Reader
with a perfect Jesuitism. In all the Primitive Times of the
Church, a *Man*, or a *Family*, or a *National Church* were ac-
counted *Right* and *Orthodox*, as they agreed with the *Catholike
Church*; But the *Catholike* was never then measured, or judged
by *Man*, *Family*, or *Nation*. But now in the *Jesuites* new
School, *The One, Holy, + Catholike Church*
must be measured by that which is in the
City or *Diocese of Rome*, or of them which
agreed with it, and not *Rome* by the *Catholike*. For so A.C. says exprely, *The Lady
would know of me, not whether that were
the Catholike Church to which Rome agreed,
but whether that were not the Holy Catholike Church,
which agreed with Rome*. So upon the matter, belike the Christian
Faith was committed to the Custody of the
Roman, not of the *Catholike Church*; and a
man cannot agree with the *Catholike Church*
of Christ (in this new Doctrine of A. C.) unless he agree with the *Church of Rome*;
but if he agree with that, all's safe, and he*

* And though Staples to magnifie the
Church of Rome, is pleased to lay :
*quod utrum pro ratione habita fuit Ecclesia
Romana & Ecclesia Catholica*: yet he is
so modest as to give this Reason of it:
*Quia ipsius Communione erat evidenter & cer-
tissimum cuiusdam Catholica. Relig. Cap. 1.
q. 4. s. 3. c. 10.* The Communion of
the *Roman* was then with the *Catholike Church*,
not of the *Catholike* with it.) And S. cyrius employed his Legates
Caldonius and *Beruzanius*, not to bring
the *Catholike Church* to the *Commun-
ion of Rome*, but *Rome* to the *Catholike Church*.
*Elaboratio, ac ad Catholica Ecclesia unitam, sicut corporis membra
componuntur, &c.* Now the Members of
Rome, then in an open Schism between
Cornelius and *Neustrian*. S. Cyr. L. 2.
Epis. 10.

is as *Orthodox*, as he need be.

NUM. 5.

A.C. p. 54.

But A. C. is yet troubled about the form of the *Ladies* Que-
stion. And he will not have it, *That she desired to know, whe-
ther I would grant the Roman Church to be the Right Church?* Though these be her words, according to the *Jesuites* own set-
ting down, but he thinks the Question was, *Whether the Church
of Rome was not the Right Church?* Not Be not, but was not.
Was not? That is, was not once or in time past the Right
Church before Luther and others made a breach from it? Why,
truly A. C. needed not have troubled himself half so much a-
bout this. For let him take his Choice. It shall be all one to
show you cause why *any* *right* *Church* (as we have seen
in the last page) is *right* *Church* (me,

me, whether the Question were asked by *Re*, or by *wa*? For the Church of Rome neither is, nor was the Right Church, as the Lady desired to hear. A Particular Church, it is, and ever, and in some times right, and in some times wrong; and then in some things right, and in some things wrong. But The Right Church, or The Holy Catholike Church it never was, nor ever can be. And therefore was not such before Luther, and Others either left it, or were thrust from it. A particular Church it was; But then A.C. is not distinct enough here neither. For the Church of Rome both was, and was not a Right, or Orthodox Church before Luther made a Breach from it. For the word *Ante*, Before, may look upon Rome, and that Church a great way off, or long before; and then in the Prime times of it, it was a most Right and Orthodox Church. But it may look also nearer home, and upon the immediate times before Luther, or some Ages before that; And then in those times * Rome was a Corrupt and a tainted Church, far from being Right. And yet both these times Before Luther made his Breach. So here A.C. shold have been more distinct. For the word *Before* includes the whole time before Luther, in part of which time that Church of Rome was Right, and in other part whereof it was wrong. But t. A.C. adds yet, That I suspected the Lady would infer, if once that Church were Right, what hindred it now to be? Since that did not depart from the Protestant Church, but the Protestant Church from it. Truly, I neither suspected the Inference would be made, nor fear it, when it is made. For 'tis no News that any Particular Church, Roman, as well as another, may once have been Right, and afterwards wrong, and in far worse case. And so it was in Rome after the enemy had sown Tares among the wheat. || S. Mat. 13. But whether these Tares were sown, while their Bishops slept; or whether * They themselves did not help to sow them, is too large a Disquisition for this Place. So though it were once Right, yet the Tares which grow thick.

And I think Cassandra was in this Prophetical. For sixty years and more before Luther was born, and so before the great troubles which have since fallen upon all Christendom, he wrote these words in the Book which himself delivered up in the Council of Constance: *Nisi celeriter fiat Reformatio, undic dicere quod licet magna sit, que videtur, tanta in brevi incomparabiliter maiora videtur. Et post ista transversa tam fortiora, majora etiam arborum, &c.* Cramer. i. de Refor. Eccles. And it will hardly sink into any mans judgment, that so great a man, as Pet. de Almaine was in that Church, should speak thus, if he did not see some Errors in the Doctrine of that Church, as well as in Manners. Nay Cassandra, though he lived and dyed in the Communion of the Church of Rome, yet found fault with some of her Doctrines. Confut. Aris. p. 21 & 22. And Pope Julius the third Professed at Bononia, *Si sacramentorum Ecclise ministerium incongruum esset irregulare.* Episcopatus in Ut. 1, and yet he was one of the Bishops, say the chief Legat in the Council of Trent.

A.C. p. 94.

S. Mat. 13. 36.

For A.C. knows well, what strange Doctrines are charged upon some Popes. And all Bellarmine's labour, though great and full of Art, is not able to wash them clean. Bellarm. i. ap. ad Gal. Post. c. 8, q. 4. Et Papam quodam gravissimis erroribus suinatis in Ecclesia Christi luce clarus est. Et probato a Iaco. Almain. Opusc. de Anter. Ecclesie, c. 10. And Bellarmine speaks it out more plainly: *Minim illi* (He speaks of the Bishops and Rectors in the Roman Church) *quoniam haec informatae inter se sunt, non ipsi hanc Superstitutionem Autores sunt;* *qui ergo eam in animis habentes simpliciter obsequuntur, eam & exercitent.* Bellarm. Confut. Aris. 21. versus finem.

in it, are the Cause why 'tis not so now. And then though that Church did not depart from the Protestant Church yet if it gave great and just Cause for the Protestant Church to depart from the Errors of it, while it in some Particulars departed from the Truth of Christ, it comes all to one for this Particular, That the Roman Church which was once right, is now become wrong, by embracing Superstition and Error.

F. Further he confessed, That Protestants had made a Rent and Division from it.

§. 21.
NUM. I.

⁴ *Grave omnia crimes, sed definitum
longinquam non requirit, satie ad eum at-
gare; sicut pro Ecclesia olim. S. Aug. de
milit. scd. 5.*

[†] Hanc quo respectu bonorum Ecclesia dicitur, obseruare, eisque Communionem coram aliis. Calv. ill. Act. 1.

29

I said, nor thought that the *Protestants* made this *Rent*. The Cause of the *Schism* is yours; for you thrust us from you; because we called for *Truth*, and *Redress of Abuses*. For a *Schism* must needs be theirs, whose the *Cause* of it is. The *Woe* runs full out of the mouth of * *Christ*, ever against him, that gives the *Offence*; not against him that takes it, ever. But you have, by this carriage, given me just cause, never to treat with you, or your like, but before a *Judge*, or a *Jury*.

I shall not compare you with them, nor give any Offence that way. I shall only draw the general Argument from thence; that if the Orthodox did well in departing from the Arians, then the Schism was to be imputed to the Arians, although the Orthodox did depart from them. Otherwise if the Orthodox had been guilty of the Schism, he could not have said, *Nihil sciam nisi scripti recordo.* For it cannot be that a man should do well in making a Schism. There may be therefore a necessary separation, which yet bears not the blame of Schism; and that is, when Doctrines are taught contrary to the Catholick

Fishes 1991 20(1)

THE JOURNAL

14.5.2.
A.F.9.55,55.

卷之三

But here A. C. tells me, *I had no cause to be angry, either with the Jesuite, or my self.* Not with the Jesuite, for he writ down my words in fresh memory, and upon special notice taken of the Passage, and that I did say either *isidem*, or *equipollentibus verbis*, either in these, or equivalent words, *That the Protestants did make the Rent, or Division from the Roman Church.* What, did the Jesuite set down my words in fresh memory, and upon special notice taken, and were they so few as these, *The Protestants did make the Schism;* and yet was his memory so short, that he cannot tell, whether I uttered this *isidem*, or *equipollentibus verbis?* Well, I would A. C. and his Fellows would leave

leave this *Art* of theirs, and in *Conferences* (which * they are so ready to call for) impose no more upon other men, than they utter. And you may observe too, that after all this full Assertion, that I spake this *isidem*, or *equipollentibus verbis*, A. C. concludes thus : *The Jesuite took special notice in fresh memory,*^{* A.C.p.57.} *and is sure he related, at least in sense, just as it was uttered.*^{A.C.p.58.} What's this, *At least in sense just as it was uttered?* Do not these two Enterfeire, and shew the Jesuite to be upon his shuffling pace? For if it were *just as it was uttered*, then it was in the very form of words too, not in *sense* only. And if it were but *At least in sense*, then when A. C. hath made the most of it, *it was not just as twas uttered.* Besides, *at least in sense*, doth not tell us in *whose sense* it was. For if A. C. mean the Jesuite's *sense* of it, he may make what sense he pleases of his own words; but he must impose no sense of his upon my words. But as he must leave my words to my self, so when my words are uttered, or written, he must leave their sense either to me, or to that *genuine Construction*, which an *Ingenuous Reader* can make of them. And what my words of *Grant* were, I have before expressed, and their sense too.

Not with my self : That's the next. For A.C. says, 'Tis truth, ^{N U M . 3:} *and that the world knows it, that the Protestants did depart from the Church of Rome, and got the name of Protestants, by protesting against it.* No, A. C. by your leave, this is not truth neither; and therefore I had reason to be angry with my self, had I granted it. For, first, the Protestants did not *depart*: For *departure* is voluntary, so was not *theirs*. I say, not *theirs*, taking their *whole Body and Cause* together. For that some among them were *peevish*, and some *ignorantly zealous*, is neither to be doubted, nor is there danger in confessing it. Your *Body* is not so perfect (I wot well) but that many amongst *you* are as *pettish*, and as *ignorantly zealous*, as any of *Ours*. You must not suffer for *these*, nor We for *those*; nor should the *Church of Christ* for *either*. Next, the *Protestants* did not get that Name by *Protesting against the Church of Rome*, but by *Protesting* (and that when nothing else would serve) [†] against her *Errors and Superstitions*. Do you but remove them from the *Church of Rome*, and our *Protestation* is ended, and the *Separation* too. Nor is *Protestation* it self such an unheard-of thing in the very heart of *Religion*. For the *Sacraments* both of the *Old and New Testament* are called by your own *school*, *Visible Signs protesting the Faith*. Now if the *Sacraments* be *Protestantia*, *Signes Protestant*, why may not men also, and without all offence, be

[†] *convenitus fuit Ordinum Imperii Spira: ibi Decretum factum est, ac Edictum 1529. matens observaretur contra Novatores, (sic appellare placuit) & ut omnia in integrum restituatur (ac sic nulla omnina Reformatio.) contra hoc Edictum solennis fuit protestatio, Aprilis 16. An. Chr. 1529. Et hinc ortum perulgatum illud Protestantium nomen. Sc. Calvii. cibro. ad Ann. 1529. This *Protestation* therefore was not simply against the Roman Church, but against the *Edict*, which was for the restoring of all things to their former estate, without any Reformation.*

called *Protestants*, since by receiving the true *Sacraments*, and by refusing them which are corrupted, they do but *Protest* the sincerity of their Faith against that Doctrinal Corruption, which hath invaded the great *Sacrament of the Eucharist*, and other Parts of Religion? Especially, since they are *men** which must protest their Faith by these visible Signs and Sacraments.

But A. C. goes on, and will needs have it, that the *Protestants* were the Cause of the *Schism*. For (faith he) though the Church of Rome did thrust them from her by *Excommunication*, yet they had first divided themselves by obstinate holding, and teaching Opinions contrary to the Roman Faith, and Practice of the Church; which to do, S. Bernard thinks is *Pride*, and S. Augustine *Madness*. So then, in his Opinion; First, *Excommunication* on their Part was not the Prime Cause of this Division; but the holding and teaching of contrary Opinions. Why but then in my Opinion, That holding and teaching was not the Prime Cause neither, but the Corruptions and Superstitions of Rome, which forced many men to hold, and teach the contrary. So, the Prime Cause was theirs still. Secondly, A. C's words are very considerable. For he charges the *Protestants* to be the Authors of the *Schism*, for obstinate holding and teaching contrary Opinions. To what I pray? Why to the † *Roman Faith*. To the *Roman Faith*? It was wont to be the *Christian Faith*, to which contrary Opinions were so dangerous to the Maintainers. But all's *Roman* now-with A.C. and the *Jesuite*. And then to countenance the Busines, S. Bernard and S. Augustine are brought in, whereas neither of them speak of the *Roman*, and S. Bernard perhaps neither of the *Catholike*, nor the *Roman*, but of a *Particular Church*, or Congregation. Or if he speak of the *Catholike*, of the *Roman* certainly he doth not. His

† I know Bellarm. quotes S. Jerome: *Sic et Romanam Fidem, &c.* *in p[ro]p[ri]etate S. 3. Ns. 9.* But there S. Jerome doth not call it *Fidem Romanam*, as if *Fides Romana* and *Fides Catholica* were convertible: but he speaks of it in the Concrete, *Romana Fides*, i. *Romanorum Fides*, que lantata fuit ab Apolo, &c. *Rom. 1.8.* S. Hieron. *Apol. 3.*, cont. Ruffin. That is, that Faith which was then at *Rome* when S. Paul commended it. But the Apostles commanding of it in the Romans at one time, passes no deed of Assurance, that it shall continue worthy of Commendations among the Romans through all times.

words are, *Quae major superbia, &c.* What greater pride, than that one man should prefer his judgment before the whole Christian Churches in the world? So A. C. out of Saint Bernard. || But Saint Bernard not so. For these last words (of all the Christian Churches in the world) are not in Saint Bernard. And whether *Toti Congregationi* imply more in that Place than a

|| *Quae major superbia, quia ut unus homo toti congregacioni judicium suum preferat, tanquam ipsi filius Spiritum Dei habebat?* S. Bern. *Serm. 3. de Refut.*

Particular Church, is not very manifest. Nay I think 'tis plain, that he speaks both of, and to that *particular Congregation* to which he was then preaching. And I believe A.C. will not easily find where *tota Congregatio*, the whole Congregation, is used in Saint Bernard, or any other of the Fathers, for the whole

most natiue to which a man of spirit can ad
whole Catholike Church of Christ. And howsoever the mean-
ing of S. Bernard be, 'tis one thing for a private man, *Judici-
um suum preferre, to prefer, and so follow his private Judg-
ment, before the Whole Congregation*; which is indeed, *Lepra
proprii Conflitii* (as S. Bernard there calls it) the proud Le-
prosie of the Private Spirit. And quite another thing for an
Intelligent man, and in some things unsatisfied, modestly to
propole his doubts even to the Catholike Church. And much
more may a whole National Church, nay the whole Body of
the Protestants do it. And for S. Augustine, the Place alledg-
ed out of him is a known Place. And he speaks indeed of the
Whole Catholike Church. And he * says
(and he says it truly) *It's a part of most
insolent madnes, for any Man to dispute,
whether that be to be done, which is usually
done in, and through the whole Catholike
Church of Christ.* Where first here's not a
word of the Roman Church, but of that which is *tota per
Orbum, all over the World, Catholike*, which Rome never yet
was. Secondly, A. C. applies this to the *Roman Faith*, where
as S. Augustine speaks there expressly of the *Rites and Ceremo-
nies of the Church*, and † particularly about the Manner of Offering upon Ma-
undy-Thursday, whether it be in the Morning, or after Supper, or both. Thirdly, 'tis
manifest, by the words themselves, that S. Augustine speaks of
no Matter of Faith there, *Roman*, nor *Catholike*. For *Frequen-
tat*, and *Faciendum* are for Things done,
and to be done, not for Things believed,
or to be believed. So here's not One Word
for the *Roman Faith* in either of these Pla-
ces. And after this, I hope you will the
less wonder at A. C.'s Boldness. Lastly, a right
sober man may without the least Touch of *Insolencie or Mad-
nes*, dispute a *Business of Religion* with the *Roman* either
Church or Prelate; (as all men know * Ireneus did with Victor.)<sup>* Euseb. L. 5.
Hib. Eccl. c. 26.</sup>

^{† Socrat. L. 5. Hist. eccl. c. 22.} to be with *Modesty*, and for the finding out, or *Confirming*
of *Truth*, free from *Vanity*, and *purposed Opposition* against
any *Particular Church*. But in any other way to dispute the
Whole Catholike Church, is just that which S. Augustine calls it,
Insolent Madnes.

But now were it so, that the *Church of Rome* were Ortho-
dox in all things, yet the *Faith*, by the Jesuites leave, is not
simply to be called the *Roman*, but the *Christian*, and the *Ce-
tholike Faith*: And yet A. C. will not understand this, but
Roman and *Catholike*, whether *Church or Faith*, must be one
and the same with him; and therefore insers, *That there can*

be no just Cause to make a Schism or Division from the whole Church. For the whole Church cannot universally erre in Doctrine of Faith. That the whole Church cannot universally erre in the Doctrine of Faith, is most true, and 'tis granted by divers * Protestants (so

* Quod si, An Ecclesia totalem tamen confidemus, i. prae omnibus summi Electis, dum sine dubio Militant Ecclesia, posse errare, vel in tua parte, vel in gravius facta parte? Et respondemus simpliciter, id est in postulato. Reckhami Syst. Theol. p. 387. Edit. Edmonia, A. 1602. Calvinus & saec. Herveticus concedunt Ecclesiam suam esse posse deficiere. Sed dicunt intelligi debere de Ecclesia invisibili. Bellar. L. 3. de Eccles. milit. c. 13. S. 1. But this Exceptio of Bellarmino's, that the Protestants, whom, out of his liberality, he calls Heretics, speak of the Invisible Church, is masterly frievolous. For the Church of the Elect is in the Church of them that are Saved, and the Invisible Church in the Visible. Therefore if the whole Church of the Elect cannot erre in Fundamental, the whole Visible Church, in which the same Elect are, cannot erre. Now that the Invisible Church of the Elect is in the Visible, is manifest out of St. Augst. q/a of Ecclesia, que intra agnam Dominicam cum multis pithibus nata. S. Aug. Epist. 48. Graza sunt inter illam paleam, quando Arca cum vestimenta, palte putatur. S. Aug. in Psal. 121. And this is proved at large by Hobbes. L. 3. Eccles. Pd. S. 1. But else the Elect or Invisible Church is tied to no duty of Christianity. For all such Duties are required of the Church, as 'tis Visible, and performed in the Church, as 'tis Visible. As we hold it impossible, that the Church should ever by Apostasy and Infidelity, wholly depart from God, &c. So we hold, that it never falls into Heresy. So that Bellarmino is at much to be blamed for idle and needless busing himself to prove, that the Visible Church never falls into Heresy, which we most willingly grant. Field. L. 4. de Eccles. c. 2. Taking the Church for all the Believers now living, and in things necessary to be known expressly. Ibid. Calvinus dicit hanc Propositionem Ecclesia non potest erre. Terram est. insitumque non explicit refutatio. Prima est, si non proponet Prognostica contra Scripturam, hoc. (And indeed Calvin doth say so, L. 4. Instit. c. 8. S. 13.) Secunda est, si intelligatur de sola Ecclesia Universali, non autem de Ecclesiastica. Bellar. L. 3. de Eccles. milit. c. 14. S. 4. And I hope it is as good and a better Refutation in Calvin. To say the Catholic Church cannot erre, if it keep to the Scripture, than for Bellarmino to say, The particular Church of Rome cannot erre, because of the Pope's refuting them. If the Pope cannot erre, if he keep his Chair a which yet he affirms, L. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 4. S. 2.

you will but understand its not erring, in Absolute Fundamental Doctrines.) And therefore 'tis true also, that there can be no just Cause to make a Schism from the whole Church. But here's the Jesuite's Cunning. The whole Church, with him, is the Roman, and those parts of Christendom, which subject themselves to the Roman Bishop. All other parts of Christendom, are in Heresy and Schism, and what A. C. pleases. Nay soft. For another Church may separate from Rome, if Rome will separate from Christ. And so far as it separates from Him and the Faith, so far may another Church sever from it. And this is all that the Learned Protestants do or can say: And I am sure all that ever the Church of England hath either said, or done. And that the whole Church cannot erre in Doctrines absolutely Fundamental, and Necessary to all

S. Mat. 16. 18, mens Salvation. (besides the Authority of those Protestants, most of them being of prime Rank,) seems to me to be clear by the Promise of Christ, S. Matth. 16. That the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. Whereas most certain it is, that the Gates of Hell prevail very far against it, if the Whole Militant Church universally taken, can erre, from, or in the Foundation. But then this Power of not Erring is not to be conceived, as if it were in the Church prim. & per se. Originally, or by any power it hath of it self: For the Church is constituted of Men, and Humani est errare, all men can erre. But this Power is in it, partly by the virtue of this Promise of Christ: and partly by the grace of God, who did not give any man to be a

ly by the Matter which it teacheth, which is the unerring Word of God, so plainly and manifestly delivered to her, as that it is not possible she should universally fall from it, or teach against it in things absolutely necessary to salvation. Besides, it would be well weighed, whether to believe or teach otherwise, will not impeach the Article of the Creed concerning the Holy Catholike Church, which we profess we believe. For the Holy Catholike Church there spoken of, contains not only the whole Militant Church on earth, but the whole Triumphant also in Heaven. For so * S. Augustine hath long since taught me. Now if the whole Catholike Church in this large extent be Holy, then certainly the whole Militant Church is Holy, as well as the Triumphant, though in a far lower degree, in as much as all [†] Sanctification, all Holiness is imperfect in this life, as well in Churches, as in Men. Holy then the whole Militant Church is. For that which the Apostle speaks of Abraham, is true of the Church, which is a Body Collective made up of the spiritual seed of Abraham, Rom. 11. If the root be holy, so are the branches. Well then, Rom. 11. 16; the whole Militant Church is Holy, and so we believe. Why but, will it not follow then, That the whole Militant Church cannot possibly erre in the Foundations of the Faith? That she may erre in Superstructures and Deductions, and other by, and unnecessary Truths, if her Curiosity, or other weaknes carry her beyond, or cause her to fall short of her Rule, no doubt need be made. But if She can erre either from the Foundation, or in it, She can be no longer Holy, and that Article of the Creed is gone. For if She can erre quite from the Foundation, then She is nor Holy, nor Church, but becomes an Infidel. Now this cannot be. For || all Divines, Ancient and Modern, Romanists and Reformers, agree in this, That the whole Militant Church of Christ cannot fall away into general Apostacie. And if She Erre in the Foundation, that is, in some one or more Fundamental Points of Faith, then She may be a Church of Christ still, but not Holy, but becomes Heretical: And most Certain it is, that no ^{*} Assembly (be it never so general) of such Heretics, is, or can be Holy. Other Errors that are of a meaner ^{day} take not Holiness from the Church; but these that are dyed in grain cannot consist with Holiness, of which Faith in Christ is the very Foundation. And therefore if we will keep up our Creed, the whole Militant Church must be still Holy. For

* Ecclesia hic una accipienda est, non sed
tum ex parte quæ propaginatur in terra,
&c. verum etiam ex illa parte que in celo,
&c. S. Aug. Eccl. c. 56.

[†] Nemo ex 1000
Sanctus, Op-
erat. L. 7 contra
Parmen.

|| Dm Christus orat in Excelso, Navicula
(id. Et. Ecclesia) turbatur fluitibus
in profundo, &c. id quia Christus orat,
non potest mergi. S. August. Serm. 14. de
Verb. Dom. c. 2. Et. Bellar. L. 3. de Ec-
cles. Milit. c. 13. Prefidio Christi fulci-
tur Ecclesie perpetuas, ut inter turbu-
lentias agitacionis, & formidabilis motus,
&c. salva sancta mentis. Calvin. L. 2. In-
stit. c. 15. S. 3. Id/ Symboli dispositio-
ne admodum perpetuam residere in Eccle-
sia Christi remissum Pecatorum. Calv.
L. 4. Instit. c. 1. S. 17. Now remission
of sins cannot be perpetual in the
Church, if the Church it self be not
perpetual. But the Church it self can-
not be perpetual, if it fall away.
^{*} Spiritus Sanctificatiois non potest inva-
niri in Hereticorum mentibus, S. Hieronim
in Jerom. 10.

if it be not so still ; then there may be a time, that *Falsum* may *subesse Fidei Catholice*. That falsehood, and that in a high degree, in the very Article, may be the Subject of the *Catholike Faith*, which were no less than *Blasphemy* to affirm. For we must still believe the *Holy Catholike Church*. And if She be not still *Holy*, then at that time when She is not so, we believe a *Falshood* under the *Article of the Catholike Faith*. Therefore a very dangerous thing it is to cry out in general terms, *That the whole Catholike Militant Church can Erre*, and not limit nor distinguish in time, that it can erre indeed : for *Ignorance* it hath, and *Ignorance* can *Erre*. But *Erre* it cannot, either by falling totally from the *Foundation*, or by *Heretical Error* init. For the *Holiness* of the Church consists as much, if not more, in the *Verity* of the *Faith*, as in the *Integrity of Manners* taught and Commanded in the *Doctrine of Faith*.

NUM. 5.
A.C. p.35.

* 5.21.Ns.1.

A.C. p.36.

NUM. 7.
A.C. p.39.

Now in this Discourse A.C. thinks he hath met with me. For he tells me, *That I may not only safely grant, that Protestants made the Division that is now in the Church; but further also, and that with a safe Confidence, as one did, was it not you? said he, That it was ill done of those, who first made the Separation.* Truly I do not now remember, whether I said it or no. But because A.C. shall have full satisfaction from me, and without any *Terciversation*, if I did not say it then, I do say it now ; and most true it is, *That it was ill done of those, who ere they were, that first made the separation.* But then A.C. must not understand me of *Actual* only, but of *Causal* separation. For (as I said * before) the *Schism* is theirs, whose the *Cause* of it is : And he makes the Separation, that gives the *first just Cause* of it ; not he that makes an *Actual Separation* upon a just Cause preceding. And this is so evident a Truth, that A.C. cannot deny it ; for he says, 'tis *most true*. Neither can he deny it in this sense, in which I have expressed it ; for his very Assertion against us (though false) is in these Terms, *That we gave the first Cause* ; Therefore he must mean it of *Causal*, not of *Actual Separation* only.

But then A.C. goes on and tells us, *That after this Breach was made, yet the Church of Rome was so kind and careful to seek the Protestants; that She invited them publickly with Safe-conduit to Rome, to a General Council, freely to speak what they could for themselves.* Indeed I think the Church of Rome did carefully seek the Protestants ; But I doubt it was to bring them within their Net. And she invited them to Rome, A very safe place, if you mark it, for them to come to ; just as the Lyon (in the

* Olim quod unipes agros causa Leonis
Responsum, refutam, Qui a me usq[ue] a terrae
Gensis et aduersum ipsissimam, nulla retrorsum.

Hor. L. 1. Ep. q. 12. Mop.

* *Apologue*) invited the Fox to his own Den. Yea, but there was *Safe-Conduit* offered too ? Yes, *Conduits* perhaps,

perhaps, but not safe; or safe perhaps for going thither, but none for coming thence. *Vestigia nulla retrorsum.* Yea, but it should have been to a General Council? Perhaps so. But was the *Conduitt* safe, that was given for coming to a Council, which they call General, to some others before them? No sure, * John Hus, and Jerome of Prague burnt for all their Safe-Conduitt. And so long as † Jesuites write and maintain, That *Faith given is not to be kept with Hereticks*: And the *Church of Rome* leaves this lewd *Doctrine* uncensured (as it hath hitherto done, and no exception put in of force and violence:) A.C. shall pardon us, that we come not to *Rome*, nor within the reach of *Roman Power*, what *freedom of Speech* soever be promised us. For to what end *Freedom of Speech* on *their part*, || since they are resolv'd to alter nothing? And to what end *Freedom of speech* on *our part*, if after speech hath been free, life shall not? ¶

fides, frui salvis conduittus concedatur Iure communi sive speciali. *Bec. Dis. Theol. de Fidei Hereticis servanda,* §. 10. S. 5. But for all this Brag of † *Affirmant una coegerunt omnes Catholici* & *Becanus* shuffles pitifully, to defend the *Council of Constance*. For thus he argues: *Fides non est violata Husio. Non a Patribus & illuc-um fidem non redempt. Non ab Imperatore Sigismundo: Illi enim dedit fidem, sed non violavit.* Ibid. §. 7. But all men know that the Emperor was used by the Fathers at *Constance* to bring *Hus* snicher. *Sigismundus Hussum Constantiam vocat, et missis Literis publicâ file cœvit, magis Oldeb.* Anno 1414. *Opus. Edit. in 16. Et* viatoris Prima graviter radii Hussi in carcerationem, tamen cum diceret Fidei Hereticis non esse servandam, *non modo remissi Offensionem, sed & primis verbis suum promissum fecit.* Ibid. This is a mockery. And *Becanus* his Argument is easily turned upon himself. For if the Fathers did it in taunting, that the Emperor should give Safe-conduct which themselves meant not to keep, then they broke Faith. And if the Emperor knew, they would not keep it, then he himself broke faith, in giving a Safe-Conduct, which he knew to be invalid. And as cause is so answer what *Becanus* adds to save that Council's Act could I stay upon it.

Fides Hereticis data servanda non est, sed nec Tyrannus, Piratis & curris publicis præstatibus, &c. Simanca, lxxij. Tit. 46. S. 51. And although *Becanus* in the place above cited, §. 15, confidently denies, that the Fathers at *Constance* decreed, *No faith to be kept with Hereticks*, and cites the words of the Council, Sess. 19, yet there the very words themselves have it thus: *Possit Concilium nos paire, &c. etiam si de fato conduittus confisi ad locum viserint Iudicari, &c.* And much more plainly *Simanca*, Inscript. 46. S. 52. *Iure igitur Hereticis quidam gravissimo Concilii Constantini Judicis legitimâ summâ concordati sunt, quamvis promissa illis fecerit as fuisse.* So they are not only Protestants which charge the *Council of Constance* with this. Nor can *Becanus* say as he doth, *Affirmant una coegerunt omnes Catholici, fidem Hereticis servandas esse:* For *Simanca* denies it; & And he quotes others for it, which A.C. would be loath should not be accounted *Catholikes*. But how faithfully *Simanca* says the one, or *Becanus* the other, let them take it between them, and the Reader be judge. In the mean time the very Title of the Canon of the Council of *Constance*, Sess. 19, is this: *Quod non obstantibus saluis conduittibus Imperatoris Regum, &c. possit per Judicem competentem de Heretica præstatute inquiri.*

¶ For so much A.C. confesses, p. 43. For if they should give way to the altering of one, then why not of another, and another, and so of all? And the *Non-Papists* see a great point of *Doctrine* being amazed, and not knowing what to answere to a Bishop of their own, yet were resolv'd not to part with their common error. *Certum tamen erat Doctrinam eam non probare, sed quam antea didicissent firmiter tenere, &c. His. Con. Trid. L. 2. q. 377. Edit. Leyd. 1622.*

And yet for all this, A.C. makes no doubt, but that the Roman Church is so far from being Cause of the continuance of the Schism, or hinderance of the Re-union, that it would yet give a free hearing with most ample Safe-Conduitt, if any hope might be given, that the Protestants would sincerely seek nothing but Truth and Peace. Truly A.C. is very Resolute for the Roman Church; yet how far he may undertake for it, I cannot tell.

But

* Though I
cannot justi-
fie all which
these two
men said, yet
safe Conduitt
being given,
that Publike
Faith ought
not to have
been viola-
ted.

† *Affirmant
uno consensu
omnes Catholici
debet Hereti-
ciscos ferre*

N. U. M. 8.
A. C. p. 57.

But for my part, I am of the same Opinion for the continuing of the Schism, that I was for the making of it. That is, that it is ill, very ill done of those, whoever they be, Papists, or Protestants, that give just Cause to continue a Separation. But for free hearings, or Safe-Conduits, I have said enough till that Church do not only say, but do otherwise. And as for Truth and Peace, they are in every mans mouth with you, and with us; But lay they but half so close to the hearts of men, as they are common on their tongues, it would soon be better with Christendom, than at this day it is, or is like to be. And for the Protestants in general, I hope they seek both Truth and Peace, sincerely. The Church of England, I am sure doth, and hath taught me to pray for both, as I most heartily do. But what Rome doth in this, if the world will not see, I will not Censure.

*¶ I desire to add, that it is now no doubt to us all, that
God to inspire continually the Universal
Church with the Spirit of Truth, Unity, and Concord, &c. In the Prayer for the Militant Church. And in the third
Collect on Good-Friday.*

N.U.M. 9.
A.C. p. 57.

* Campian,
Prefat. Ratio-
nibus prefisâ.

† S. 26. N. 1.

And for that, which A.C. adds, That such a free hearing to more than ever the English Catholikes could obtain, though they have often offered, and desired it, and that but under the Prince's word: And that no Answer hath, nor no good Answer can be given. And he cites Campian for it. How far, or how often this hath been asked by the English Romaniſts, I cannot tell, nor what Answer hath been given them. But surely Campian was too bold, and so is A.C. too, to say * Honestum responsum nullum, no good Answer can be given. For this, I think is a very good Answer; That the Kings and the Church of England had no Reason to admit of a Publike Dispute with the English Romish Clergy, till they shall be able to shew it under the Seal, or Powers of Rome, That that Church will submit to a Third, who may be an Indifferent Judge between us and them; or to such a General Council as is after † mentioned. And this is an Honest, and I think a full Answer. And without this all Disputation must end in Clamour; And therefore the more publike, the worse. Because as the Clamour is the greater, so perhaps will be the Schism too.

F. Moreover he said, he would ingenuously acknowledge, That the Corruption of Manners in the Romish Churc, was not a sufficient Cause to justify their Departing from it.

§. 22.

B. I would I could say, you did as ingenuously repeat, as I did Confess. For I never said, That Corruption of Manners was, or was not a sufficient Cause to justify their Departure. How could I say this, since I did not grant that they did Depart,

F. But (saith he) beside Corruption of Manners, there were also Errors in Doctrine.

B. This I spake indeed. And can you prove that I spake not true in this? But I added (though here again you are pleased to omit it) That some of the Errors of the Roman Church were dangerous to Salvation. For it is not every light Error in Disputable Doctrine, and Points of curious Speculation, that can be a just Cause of Separation in that Admirable Body of Christ, which is his * Church, or of one Member of it from another. For he gave his Natural Body, to be rent and torn upon the Cross, that his Mystical Body might be One. And §. 23. Eph.1.23.

* S. Aug. Epist. 96. Et item Columba
non fuit qui Ecclesiam diffinire, accipi-
tricent, Mitio fuit: Non laicus Colum-
ba, &c. S. Aug. tr. 4. 5. in S. John.

And St. * Augustine infers upon it; That he
is no way partaker of Divine Charity, that
is an enemy to this Unity. Now what Er-
rors in Doctrine may give just Cause of Se-
paration in this Body, or the Parts of it one
from another, were it never so easie to determine, (as I think it
is most difficult) I would not venture to set it down in parti-
cular, lest in these times of Discord, I might be thought to o-
pen a Door for Schism; which surely I will never do, unless
it be to let it out. But that there are Errors in Doctrine, and
some of them such, as most manifestly endanger Salvation, in
the Church of Rome, is evident to them that will not shut their
Eyes. The proof whereof runs through the Particular Points,
that are between us; and so is too long for this Discourse. Now
here A. C. would fain have a Reason given him, Why I did en-
deavour to shew what Cause the Protestants had to make that Rent
or Division, if I did not grant that they made it. Why truly
in this reasonable demand I will satisfie him. I did it partly be-
cause I had granted in the general, that Corruption in Manners
was no sufficient cause of Separation of one Particular Church
from another; and therefore it lay upon me, at least to Name
in general what was: and partly because he, and his Party will
needs have it so, that we did make the Separation: And there-
fore though I did not grant it, yet am I thought it could not
be, to Declare by way of Supposition, that if the Protestants
did at first Separate from the Church of Rome, they had reason
so to do: For A. C. himself confesses, That Error in Doctrine
of the Faith is a just Cause of Separation; so just, as that no
Cause is just, but that. Now had I leisure to descend into Par-
ticulars, or will to make the Rent in the Church wider, 'tis no
hard matter to prove, that the Church of Rome hath erred in
the Doctrine of Faith, and dangerously too: And I doubt I
shall afterwards descend to Particulars, A. C. his Importunity
forcing me to it.

F. Which when the General Church would not Reform, it
was lawful for Particular Churches to Reform themselves.

§. 24.
NUM. 14

B. Is it then such a strange thing, that a Particular Church
may reform it self, if the General will not? I had thought,
and do so still, That in Point of Reformation of either Man-
ners, or Doctrine, it is lawful for the Church since Christ, to
do as the Church before Christ did, and might do. The Church
before Christ consisted of Jews and Proselytes: This Church
came to have a Separation, upon a most ungodly Policie of
Jeroboam's, so that it never pieced together again. To a Com-
mon Council to reform all, they would not come. Was it not law-
ful

+ 3 Reg. 12.
27.

98 there, for that which is so in the *nature of it*, and *Fundamentally*. Nor can you justly say, That the *Church of Rome* did, or might do this, by the *Pope's Authority over the Church*. For suppose he have that, and that his *Sentence be Infallible*, (I say, suppose both, but I give neither) yet neither his *Autho-*

* Non creare, censuere Papæ, ut ei Caput. Bellar. L. quæd. Rom. Post. x. 3.

+ Lxx de chris. c. 22. §. Quodam au-
tem. Si tu taliter finis Records of
your own Truths, which are far more
likely to be kept; but when Errors are
crept in, we must be bound to tell the
piece, and the time, and I know not
what, of their Beginnings, or else they
are non Errors. As if some Errors
might not want a Record, as well as
some Truth.

where the whole
form any thing that is
is negligent, or will not.

NUM. 3. But you are as jealous of the honour of *Rome*, as + *Capellanus*, who is angry with *Beronius* about certain *Canons* in the second *Milevitan Council*, and faith. That he considered not of what consequence it was, to grant to Particular Churches the Power of making *Canons of Faith*, without consulting the *Roman See*, which (as he faith, and you with him)

was never lawful, nor ever done. But suppose this were so, my

Speech was not
Wing, OR Refusing
to MUNI

|| Rex confitetur se vobisse conditum ter-
tium Toti cum; Quia omnia ex te re-
peribus Heresis imminent in tota Ecclesie Catholica agri Synistica Negocia de-
migabat, &c. Encycl. Roman. tomum.
can. I.

Not consulting, but in Case of Neglect: Or when the difficulty of Time and Place, or other Circumstances are such, that a General Council cannot be called, or not convene. For that the *Roman See* must be consulted with, before any Reformation be made. First, most certain it is, *Capellanus* can never prove. And secondly as certain, that were it proved and practised, we should have no Reformation: For it would be long enough, before the *Church* should be cured, if that *See* alone should be her Physician, which in truth is her Disease.

Now if for all this you will say still, that a Provincial Council will not suffice, but we should have born with Things, till the time of a General Council. First, tis true, a General Council, free and entire, would have been the best Remedy, and most able for a Gangrene that had spread so far, and eaten so deep into Christianity. But what? Should we have suffered this Gangrene to endanger life and all, rather than be cured in time by a Physician of a weaker knowledge, and a less able Hand?

Hand? Secondly, We live to see since, if we had stayed and expected a *General Council*, what manner of one we should have had, if any. For that at *Trent* was neither general, nor free. And for the *Errors* which *Rome* had contracted, it confirmed them, it cured them not. And yet I much doubt, whether ever that *Council* (such as it was) would have been called, if some *Provincial* and *National Synods* under *Supreme and Regal Power*, had not first set upon this great work of *Reformation*; Which I heartily wish had in all places been as *Orderly* and *Happily* pursued, as the Work was *right Christian and good* in it self. But humane frailty, and the Heats and Distempers of men, as well as the Cunning of the Devil, would not suffer that. For even in this sense also, *The wrath of man doth not accomplish the will of God*, *s. James 1.* But I have learned not to, *s. James 1.* reject the Good, which God hath wrought, for any evil which ^{20.} men may fasten to it.

And yet if for all this, you think 'tis better for us to be *NUM. 5.* blind, than to open our own eyes; let me tell you, very *Grave* and *Learned Men*, and of your own *Party*, have taught me, That when the *Universal Church will not*, or for the Iniquities of the Times, *cannot obtain and settle a free general Council*, 'tis lawful, nay sometimes necessary to *Reform gross Abuses by a National, or a Provincial*. For, besides *Alb. Magnus*, whom I quoted * before, *Gerson*, the Learned and devout Chancellor of * *s. 24. N. 21*

Paris tells us plainly: + *That be will not deny,*

but that the Church may be reformed by parts. And that this is necessary, and that to effect it, *Provincial Councils may suffice;*

and in some things *Dioceſan*. And again,

|| *Either you ſhould reform all estates of the Church in a General Council, or command them to be reformed in Provincial Councils.*

Now *Gerson* lived about two hundred years

since. But this Right of *Provincial Synods*,

that they might decree in *Caſes of Faith*, and in *Caſes of Reformation*, where Corruptions had crept into the *Sacraments of Christ*, was practised much above a thousand years ago by

many, both *National and Provincial Synods*.

For the * *Concilium at Rome under Pope Sylvester, An. 324.*

condemned Photius and Sabellius.

(And their *Heresies* were of high Nature

against the *Faith*.) The + *Council at Gangra* about the same + *Concilium*

time condemned *Eustathius* for his condemning of *Marriage* as

unlawful. The || *first Council at Carthage*, being a *Provincial*,

condemned *Rebaptization*, much about the year 348. The || *Concilium Carthagenense*.

* *Provincial Council at Aquileia* in the year 381. in which S.

Ambrose was present, condemned *Palladius* and *Secundinus* for

embracing the *Arrian Heresy*. The + *second Council of Carthage*,

+ *Nolo tamen dicere, quin in multis partibus posset Ecclesia per suas partes reformati. Imo hoc necesse erit, sed ad hoc agendum sufficent Concilia Provincialia, &c.* Geron. Tract. de Gen. Concil. unius obedientia, pars 1. p. 222. F.

|| *Omnis Ecclesia statim aut. in Generali Concilio reformati, aut in Concilio Provincialis ab aliis reformati mandatis. Geron. Declarat. Deficiunt Veterum Ecclesiasticorum, par. 1. pag. 209. B.*

* *Concilium Photii* Rom. 2. sub *Sylvifera*.

Gang. Can. 1.

|| *Concilium Carthagenense* i. Can. 1.

|| *Concilium Carthagenense* 2. Can. 1.

* *Concilium Aquileiense* 1. Can. 1.

* *Concilium Aquileiense* 2. Can. 1.

thage handled and Decreed the Belief and Preaching of the Trinity ; And this a litte after the year 424.

* Quedam de causa fidei, unde non
Quodio Pelagianum immunit, in hoc ca-
tu tantissimo primis tradicuntur, &c. Au-
rel. Carthaginensis in Probat. Conc. Ni-
levit, apud Caraman.

+ Conc. Aurasican 2, Can. 1, 2, &c.

|| Conc. Tolet. 3. controversies about Grace and Free-will, and set the Church right in them, in the year 444. The || third Council at Toledo (a National one) in the year 589. determined many things against the Arrian Heresie about the very Prime Articles of Faith, under fourteen several Anathemas. The fourth Council at Toledo did not only handle Matters of Faith for the Reformation of that People, * but even added also soare things to the Creed, which were not expressly delivered in former Creeds. Nay the Bishops did not only practise this, to Condemn Heresies in National and Provincial Synods, and so Reform those several Places, and the Church it self by parts : But They did openly challenge this as their Right and Due, and that without any leave asked of the See of Rome. For in this Fourth Council of Toledo + They Decree, That if there happen a Cause of Faith to be settled, a General, that is, a National Synod of all Spain and Galicia shall be held thereon. And this in the year 643. Where you see, it was

+ Statuimus, ut saltem Jemel in Anno 4
Nobis concilium celebratur, si a tamen, ut
si Fidei Caula est, ut quilibet alia Ec-
clesia communis, Generalis Hispanie &
Galicia Synodus celebratur, &c. Concil.
Tolet. 4. Can. 1.

then Catholike Doctrine in all Spain, that a National Synod might be a Competent Judge in a Cause of Faith. And I would fain know, what Article of the Faith doth more concern all Christians in general, than that of Filioque ? And yet the Church of Rome her self made that Addition to the Creed without a General Council, as I have shewed || already. And if this were practised so often, and in so many places, why may not a National Council of the Church of England do the like ? as She did. For, She cast off the Pope's Usurpation, and as much as

* The Institution of a Christian Mon.
Printed An. 1534.
† In Synodo Londinensi, Sess. 8. Dis. Vii.
m. 29. Januarii. An. 1562.

|| And so in the Reformation under Hen.
ri VIII. 2. Chro. 29. and under Eliz.
4. Rg. 23. And in the time of Kar.
lus King of Spain, the Reformation there proceeded thus : Quoniam portugallius
Principes omnes Regimine sue Pontificis in
seum convertire mandauit, &c. Concil.
Tolet. 3. Can. 1. can conveniuntur sa-
cerdotes Domini apud urbem Toletanum,
ut Regis imperio ius satis communis
&c. Concil. Tolet. 4. in princ. apud Ca-
raman. And both these Synods di-
tributae Materiae of Faith.

in her lay, restored the King to his right. That appears by a * Book subscribed by the Bishops in Henry the eighth's time ; And by thet Records in the Arch-bishops Office, orderly kept, and to be seen. In the Reformation which came after, our || Princes had their parts, and the Clergy theirs. And to these Two principally the power and direction for Reformation belongs. That our Princes had their parts, is manifest by their Calling together of the Bishops, and others of the Clergy, to consider of that which might

might seem worthy *Reformation*. And the *Clergy* did their part : For being thus called together by *Regal Power*, they met in the *National Synod* of sixty two. And the *Articles* there agreed on, were afterwards confirmed by *Acts of State*, and the *Royal Assent*. In this *Synod* the *Positive Truths* which are delivered, are more than the *Polemicks*. So that a mere *Calumny* it is, That we profess only a *Negative Religion*. True it is, and we must thank *Rome* for it, our *Confession* must needs contain some *Negatives*. For we cannot but deny that *Images* are to be adored. Nor can we admit *Maimed Sacraments*. Nor grant *Prayers* in an *unknown tongue*. And in a *corrupt time*, or *place*, 'tis as necessary in *Religion* to deny *falshood*, as to assert, and vindicate *Truth*. Indeed this later can hardly be well and sufficiently done, but by the former ; an *Affirmative Verity* being ever included in the *Negative* to a *Falshood*. As for any *Error* which might fall into this (as any other *Reformation*) if any such can be found, then I say, and 'tis most true : *Reformation*, especially in *Cases of Religion*, is so difficult a work, and subject to so many *Pretensions*, that 'tis almost impossible but the *Reformers* should step too far, or fall too short, in some smaller things or other, which in regard of the far greater benefit coming by the *Reformation* it self, may well be passed over, and born withal. But if there have been any *wilful*, and *gross* errors, not so much in *Opinion*, as in *Fact*, (* *Sacrilegio* too often pretending to reform *Superstition*) that's the *Crime* of the *Reformers*, not of the *Reformation* ; and they are long since gone to God to answer it, to whom I leave them.

Stram impietatem promulgaverunt, res proprias vestras rapido appetit, dissipat nobis. Quisque donique ipsius res pauperum, vel Basilicas Congregationum, &c. non per Inflationem, sed per Avaritiam suam, dissipat nobis.
S. Aug. Epist. 48. versus finem.

* *Quisquis orbis egestate hujus Legis, quam Reges terra Christi servi- entes ad emen- dandam ve-*

But now before I go off from this Point, I must put you in *NUM. 6.* remembrance too, That I spake at that time (and so must all that will speak of that *Exigent*) of the *General Church* as it was for the most part forced under the Government of the *Roman See*. And this you understand well enough. For in your very next words you call it the *Roman Church*. Now I make no doubt, but that as the *Universal Catolike Church* would have reform'd her self, had she been in all parts freed of the *Roman Yoke* : so while she was for the most in these Western parts under that yoke, the *Church of Rome* was, if not the *Only*, yet the *Chief Hinderance* of *Reformation*. And then in this sense, it is more than clear, That if the *Roman Church* will neither *Reform*, nor suffer *Reformation*, it is lawful for any *Other Particular Church* to *Reform* it self, so long as it doth it
peacez

* And this a *Particular Church* *peaceably and orderly*, and keeps it self to the *Foundation*, and free from * *Sacrilegious*.

may do, but not a Schism. For a Schism can never be peaceable, nor orderly, and seldom free from *Sacrilege*. Out of which respects, (it may be,) as well as for the grievousness of the Crime, S. Aug. calls it *Sacrilegium Schismatis*, L. 1. de Bapt. cont. Donat. c. 8. For usually they go together.

F. I asked Quo Justice, did this appear to be so? Which Question I asked, as not thinking it equity that Protestants in their own Cause should be Accusers, Witnesses, and Judges of the Roman Church.

§. 25.
NUM. I.

B. You do well to tell the reason now, why you asked this Question; For you did not discover it at the Conference: if you had, you might then have received your Answer. It is most true: No man in common equity ought to be suffered to be *Accuser*, *Witness*, and *Judge in his own Cause*. But is there not as little reason, and equity too, that any man that is to be accused, should be the *Accused*, and yet *Witness*, and *Judge in his own Cause*? If the first may hold, no man shall be *Innocent*; and if the last, none will be *Noxent*. And what do we here with [*in their own Cause against the Roman Church*?] Why? Is it not your own too, against the Protestant Church? And if it be a *Cause* common to both, as certain it is, then neither Part alone may be Judge: If neither alone may judge, then either they must be judged by a * *Third* which stands indifferent to both, and that is the *Scripture*; or if there be a *jealousie* or *Doubt* of the *sense* of the *Scripture*, they must either both repair to the *Exposition of the Primitive Church*, and submit to that; or both call, and submit to a *General Council*, which shall be lawfully called, and fairly, and freely held with indifference to all *parties*; And that must judge the *Difference* according to *Scripture*, which must be their *Rule* as well as *Private Mens*.

NUM. 2.
A. C. p. 58.

And here after some lowd Cry against the *Pride* and *Insolent madness* of the Protestants, A. C. adds, *That the Church of Rome is the Principal, and Mother-Church: And that therefore, though it be against common equity, that Subjects and Children should be Accusers, Witnesses, Judges, and Executioners against their Prince and Mother in any case: yet it is not absurd, that in some cases, the Prince or Mother may Accuse, Witness, Judge, and if need be, execute Justice, against unjust and rebellious Subjects, or evil Children.* How far forth *Rome* is a *Prince* over the whole Church, or a *Mother* of it, will come to be shewed at *after*. In the meantime, though I cannot grant her to be either, yet let's suppose her to be both, that A. C.'s Argument may have all the strength it can have. Nor shall it force me (as plausible as it seems) to weaken the just power of *Princes* over

over

over their Subjects, or of Mothers over their Children, to avoid the shock of this Argument. For though A. C. may tell us 'tis not absurd in some Cases, yet I would fain have him name any one Moderate Prince that ever thought it just, or took it upon him to be Accuser, and Witness, and Judge in any Cause of moment against his Subjects, but that the Law had Liberty to Judge between them. For the great Philosopher tells us, "That the Chief Magistrate is a ^{magistratus & dignitatem in duabus;} Custos juris, the Guardian and ^{of 3 in ducibus; & in iuris, Arist. Eth.} keeper of the Law, and if of the Law, then ^{seu i. duci uero.} both of that equity and equality which is due unto them that are under him. And even Tiberius himself, in the Cause of Silanus, when Dolabella would have flatter'd him into more power than in wisdom he thought fit then to take to himself, he put him off thus: No, & the Laws grow less where such Power enlarges. Nor is absolute Power to be used, where there may be an orderly proceeding by Law. And for Parents, 'tis true, when Children are young, they may chaste them without other Accuser, or Witness, than themselves; and yet the children are to give them reverence. And 'tis presumed that natural affection will prevail so far with them, that they will not punish them too much. For all experience tells us (almost to the loss of Education) they * punish them too little, even when there is cause. Yet when Children are grown up, and come to some full use of their own Reason, the Apostles Rule is Colof. 3. Parents, provoke not your Children. And if the Apostle prevail not with froward Parents, there's a Magistrate, and a Law to relieve even a son against unnatural Parents: as it was in the Case of T. Manlius against his over-imperious Father. And an express Law there was among the Jews, * Deut. 21. when Children were grown up and fell into great extremities, that the Parents should then bring them to the Magistrate, and not be too busie in such cases with their own Power. So suppose Rome be a Prince, yet her Subjects must be tryed by Gods Law, the Scripture: and suppose her a Mother; yet there is, or ought to be Remedy against her for her Children that are grown up, if she forget all good Nature, and turn Stepdame to them.

Well; the Reason why the Jesuite asked the Question, ^{Quo NUM. 5.} Justice? Who should be Judge? He says was this; Because there's no equity in it, that the Protestants should be Judges

+ Minni & we quod nos gliscat Potestas, nec
secundum Imperio, ubi Legibus agi possit.
Tacit. L. 3. Annal.

4. M.D.H.
12.4.2.2.

* God used Samson as a Messenger against Eli for his over-much indulgence to his sons, 1 Sam. 3. 13. And yet Samson himself committed the very same fault concerning his own sons, 1 Sam. 8. 3. &c. And this Indulgence occasioned the Change of the Civil Government, as the former was the loss of the Priesthood, &c.

+ Colof. 3. 21.
Crimen si tribuum inter cetera dabatur,
quod si quis in iudicio nullius probri comparsus, extorrem uobis domo, proutibz,
foro, iure, concessis aquilium prohibitum,
in quaestione, prope in carcere, atque in
ergastulo deavit. Liv. dec. 1. l. 7.

* Deut. 21. 19.

12.4.2.2.

in their own Cause. But now upon more Deliberation A.C. tells us (as if he knew the Jesuites mind as well as himself, as sure I think he doth) That the Jesuite directed this Question obliquly against that speech of mine, That there were Errors in Doctrine of Faith, and that in the General Church, as the Jesuite understood my meaning. The Jesuite here took my meaning right. For I confess I said there were Errors in Doctrine, and dangerous ones too, in the Church of Rome. I said likewise, that when the General Church could not, or would not Reform such, it was lawful for Particular Churches to Reform themselves. But then I added, That the General Church (not universally taken, but in these Western parts) fell into those Errors, being swayed in these later Ages by the predominant Power of the Church of Rome, under whose Government it was for the most part forced. And all men of understanding know how oft, and how easily an Over-potent Member carries the whole with it, in any Body, Natural, Politick, or Ecclesiastical.

Yea but A.C. tells us, That never any Competent Judge did so ensue the Church; And indeed, that no Power on Earth, or in Hell it self, can so far prevail, against the General Church as to make it Erre generally in any one Point of Divine Truth, and much less to teach any thing by its full Authority to be a Matter of Faith, which is contrary to Divine Truth expressed, or involved in Scriptures rightly understood. And that therefore no Reformation of Faith can be needful in the General Church, but only in Particular Churches. And for proof of this he cites S. Mat. 16. and 28. S. Luk. 22. S. John 14. and 16. In this troublesome and quarrelling Age, I am most unwilling to meddle with the Erring of the Church in general. The Church of England is content to pass that over. And though * she tells us, That the Church of Rome hath Erred even in matters of Faith, yet of the Erring of the Church in general She is modestly silent. But since A.C. will needs have it, That the whole Church did never generally Erre in any one Point of Faith, he should do well to Distinguish, before he be so peremptory. For if he mean no more than that the whole Universal Church of Christ cannot universally Erre in any one Point of Faith simply necessary to all mens salvation, he fights against no adversary, that I know, but his own fiction. For the most

[†] Si demus errare non posse Ecclesiam in rebus ad salutem necessariis, dicimus. Absit illi: Idem hoc esse, quia abducatur omnis sua sapientia, a Spiritu Sancto doceri, et per Verbum Domini patitur. Calv. L. 4. Inst. t. 8. S. 12. And this also is our sense, Vnde qd. S. 21. M. 3.

+ Learned Protestants grant it. But if he mean, that the whole Church cannot Erre in any one Point of Divine Truth in general, which though by sundry Consequences deduced from the Principles, is yet made a Point of Faith, and may prove dangerous to the Salvation of some, which believe it, and

and practise after it, (as his words seem to import) especially, if in these the *Church* shall presume to determine without her proper Guide, the *Scripture*, as ^{*} Bellarm. says, She may, and yet not Erre. Then perhaps it may be said, and without any wrong to the *Catholike Church*, that the *Whole Militant Church* hath erred in such a Point of *Divine Truth and of Faith*. Nay A.C. confesses expressly in his very next words, *That the Whole Church may at some time not know all Divine Truths, which afterwards it may learn by study of Scripture, and otherwise*. So then in A.C.'s judgment, the *Whole Militant Church* may at some time not know all Divine Truths. Now that which knows not all, must be ignorant of some; and that which is ignorant of some, may possibly erre in one Point or other; The rather, because he confesses the knowledge of it must be got by *Learning*; and *Learners* may mistake and erre; especially where the *Lesson* is Divine Truth out of *Scripture*, out of *Difficult Scripture*. For were it of plain and easie *Scripture* that he speaks, the *Whole Church* could not at any time be without the knowledge of it. And for ought I yet see, the *Whole Church Militant* hath no greater warrant against *Not erring in*, than against *Not knowing of* the Points of Divine Truth. For in S. John 16. There is as large a Promise to the *Church* of knowing all Points of Divine Truth, as A.C. or any *Jesuite* can produce for Her *Not erring in any*. And if She may be ignorant, or mistaken in learning of any Point of Divine Truth, Doubtless in that state of Ignorance she may both Erre, and teach her Error, yea and teach that to be *Divine Truth*, which is not; Nay perhaps teach that as a *Matter of Divine Truth*, which is contrary to *Divine Truth*; Always provided it be not in any Point *simply Fundamental*, of which the *Whole Catholike Church* cannot be Ignorant, and in which it cannot Erre, as hath ^{* before} been proved.

As for the Places of *Scripture* which A.C. cites to prove that *the Whole Church cannot Err Generally in any one Point of Divine Truth*, be it Fundamental or not, they are known Places all of them, and are alledged by A.C. three several times in this short Tract, and to three several purposes. Here, to prove, That the *Universal Church* cannot Erre. Before this, to prove, that the *Tradition of the present Church* cannot Erre. After this, to prove, that the *Pope* cannot Erre. He should have done well to have added these Places a fourth time, to prove that *General Councils* cannot Erre. For so doth both ^{*} Stapleton and [†] Bellarmine. Sure A.C. and his fellows are hard driven, when they must fly to the same Places for such different purposes. For A Pope may Erre, where a *Council* doth not; And a *General Council* may Erre, where the *Catholike Church* cannot. And

^{*} *Nostra sententia est, Ecclesiam absoluere non posse errare, nec in rebus absolute necessariis, nec in aliis qua credenda voluntaria nobis propositi, sine habentur expresse in Scripturis, sine noui, Bellar. L. 3. de Ecc. Mil. s. 14. S. 3.*
A. C. p. 38.

^{* \$ 21. N. 5.}

^{NUM. 5.}

^{A.C. p. 57.}

^{a.c.p.57.}

^{a.c.p.57.}

^{73.}

^{a.c.p.58.}

^{73.}

therefore it is not likely that these places should serve alike for all. The first Place is Saint Matthew 16. There Christ told Saint Peter, and we believe it most assuredly, *That Hell-Gates shall never be able to prevail against his Church.* But that is, That they shall not prevail to make the Church Catholike Apostatize, and fall quite away from Christ, or Err in *absolute Fundamentals*, which amounts to as much. But the Promise reaches not to this, that the Church shall never Err, no not in the lightest matters of *Fact*. For it will not follow: Hell-Gates shall not prevail against the Church; Therefore *Hellish Devils* shall not tempt, or assault, and batter it. And thus Saint * Augustine understood the place. It may fight (yea and be wounded too) but it cannot be wholly overcome. And Bellarmine himself applies it to prove; + That the Visible Church of Christ cannot deserte, Err so, as quite to fall away. Therefore in his judgment, this is a true, and a safe sense of this Text of Scripture. But as for not Erring at all, in any Point of Divine Truth, and so making the Church absolutely *Infallible*, that's neither a true, nor a safe sense of this Scripture. And tis very remarkable, that whereas this Text hath been so much beaten upon by Writers of all sorts, there is no one Father of the Church for twelve hundred years after Christ (the Counterfeit or Partial Decretals of some Popes excepted) that ever concluded the *Infallibility* of the Church out of this Place: but her *Non deservicie*, that hath been, and is justly deduced hence. And here I challenge A. C. and all that party to shew the contrary,

S Mat. 28.21. if they can. The next Place of Scripture is Saint Matthew 28. The Promise of Christ that he will be with them to the end of the World. But this in the general voyce of the * Fathers of the Church is a promise of Assistance and Protection, not of an *Infallibility* of the Church. And + Pope Leo himself enlarges this presence and providence of Christ to all those things which

* S. Hil. in Psal. 24. Psalp. L. 2. devoctio. Gent. c. 2. Leo Str. 2. de Risi. Dom. c. 3. & Ep. 31. Isidor. in Jo. 1. 5. + In omnibus que Minister sui committit exequenda. S. Leo, Epis. 91. c. 2. he committed to the execution of his Ministers. But no word of *Infallibility* is to be found there. And indeed since Christ according to his Promise is present with his Ministers in all these things, and that one and a Chief of these All is the preaching of his Word to the People; It must follow, That Christ should be present with all his Ministers that Preach his Word, to make them *Infallible*; which daily Experience tells us, is not so. The third Place urged by A. C. is S. Luke 22. Where the Prayer of Christ will effect no more than his Promise hath performed; neither of them implying an *Infallibility* for, or in the Church against all Errors whatsoever. And this almost all his own side confess is spoken either of S. Peter's person only, or of him and his Successors both.

* *bobb.* Of the Church it is not spoken, and therefore cannot prove an *inerring Power* in it. For how can that place prove the Church cannot erre, which speaks not at all of the Church? And 'tis observable too, that when the *Divines of Paris* expounded this Place, that Christ here prayed for S. Peter, as he represented the *Whole Catholike Church*, and obtained for it that the Faith of the Catholike Church *nunquam deficeret*, should never so erre, as *quare so fell away*? ^{to} *Bellarmino* is so stiff for the Pope, that he says expressly, *The Exposition of the Parisians is false*, and that this Text cannot be meant of the *Catholike Church*. Not be meant of it? Then certainly it ought not to be alledged as Proof of it, as here it is by *A.C.* The fourth Place named by *A.C.* is *S. John 14*. And the consequent Place to it *S. John 16*. These Places contain another Promise of Christ concerning the coming of the *Holy Ghost*. Thus: *That the Comforter shall abide with them for ever. That this Comforter is the Spirit of Truth. And, That this Spirit of Truth will lead them into all Truth.* Now this Promise as it is applied to the Church consisting of all Believers which are and have been since Christ appeared in the Flesh, including the Apostles, is ^{+ absolute,} and without any *Restriction*. For, the *Holy Ghost* did lead them ^{as Eccles.} *into all Truth*, so that no Error was to be found in *that Church*. But as it is applicable to the whole *Church Militant* in all succeeding times, so the Promise was made with a *Limitation*, ^{+ Field, L. 4.} *namely, that the Blessed Spirit should abide with the Church for ever, and lead it into all Truth; but not simply into all Curious Truth, no not in or about the Faith, but into all Truth necessary to Salvation.* And against this Truth the *Whole Catholike Church* cannot erre, keeping her self to the direction of the Scripture, as Christ hath appointed her. For in this very Place where the Promise is made, *That the Holy Ghost shall teach you all things*, 'tis added, that *He shall bring all things to their remembrance*. What? simply all things? No: But *all things which Christ had told them*, *S. John 14*. So there is a *Limite-* ^{- S. Joh. 14.26.}

<sup>+ Bellar. L. 4. de Rom. Paul. c. 3. S. 28
igitur totia. He understood the place
of both S. Paul and his Successors.</sup>

<sup>+ See Baptis salutis. Primus quia, etc.
Bell. lib. 5. 2. And he lays 'tis false be-
cause the Parisians expounded it of the
Church only. Vobis enim profidit Eccle-
sia iste trahit, Ibid. S. 1.</sup>

<sup>A.C. p. 57.
S. John 14.
16.17.
S. Joh. 16.13.</sup>

<sup>+ And therefore proceeds further, and
says, Nequidam Proposito, sicut mem-
bres apostoli omnia preconiverat. Qua-
rumque enim expeditione, et illa signifi-
cat gratia spiritus. Theod. in 1 Tim. 3.
v. 14. 15.</sup>

of these Places can make good. & I's Assertion, *that the Whole Church cannot erre Generally in any one Point of Doctrine* is still In absolute Foundations to the contention in Definitions and such perfructures the may be found in the same.

NUM. 6.

Now to all that I have said concerning the Right which Particular Churches have to Reformation, where the General Church cannot for Impairments be well for Negligent aspi which I have prayed at large before is All the Answer that is to C. gives, is, First, *Quo Justice?* Who shall be Judge? And thence shall be the Scripture, and then Primitive Churches. And by the Rules of the one, and to the Integrity of the other, both in *Facts* and *Manners*, my Particular Church may safely Reform it self.

NUM. 7.

Secondly, *that no Reformation in Faith can be needful in the General Church, but only in Particular Churches, in which Case also Cbe faith*) Particular Churches, may not take upon them to Judge and Condemn others of Errors in Faith. While how far forth Reformation even of Faith may be necessary in the General Church, I have exprest already, and for Particular Churches, do not say, that they must take upon them to Judge or Condemn others of Error in Faith. That which I say is, *They must Reform themselves.* Now I hope, to Reformat themselves, and to Condemn others, are two different Works, unless it fall out so, that by Reforming themselves, they do by consequence Condemn any other, that is guilty in that Point, in which they Reform themselves; and so far to Judge and Condemn others, is not only lawful, but necessary. A man that lives religiously, doth not by and by sit in Judgments and Condemn with his mouth all Prophane Lives. But yet while he is silent, his very Life condemns them. And I hope in this way of *Judicature*, A. C. dares not lay his anathemation against Particular Church or man to Condemn another, he did, faithfully whatsoever A. C. can lay to the contrary, there were divers Cases, where Heresies are known, and notorious, in which it will be hard to say (as he doth) That one Particular Church must not Judge or Condemn another, so far forth anathematis to the her and protest against the Heretic of it.

NUM. 8.

A. C. p. 58. Thirdly, If one Particular Church may not judge or Condemn another, what must then be done, where Particulars need Reformation? What? Why then A. C. tells us, *that Particular Churches must in that Case, i.e. in Irenius, iustitiatione, have recourse to the Church of Rome, which hath more powerful Principality,*

and so w^t Bp^r Bishop, iudd or chief Pastor of
the whole Church, in being S. Peters Successor,
for, to whom Christ promised the Keys, S.
Matth. 16. for whom he prayed that his
Faith might not fail, S. Luke 22. And whom he charged to feed
and govern the whole Flock, S. John 21. And that (A. C. tells us) he shall never refuse to do in such sort, as that this neglect
shall be a just cause for any Particular Man, or Church, under
Pretexte of Reformation in Manners, or Faith, to make a Schism
or Separation from the Whole General Church.

Well, first you see where A. C. would have us. If any Particular Church differ in Points of Divine Truth, they must not
Judge, or condemn each other, (faith he) No, take heed of that
in any case. That's the Office of the Universal Church. And
yea he will have it, That Rome, which is only a Particular Church,
must and ought judge all other Particulars.
Secondly, he tells us this is so, Because the Church of Roma NUM. 182.
had more powerful Principality, than other Particular Church
had, that her Bishop is Pastor of the whole world, and had
For this I answer, that it is most true indeed, the Church of Roma
hath had, and hath yet, more powerful Principality, than
any other Particular Church. But she hath not this Power
from Christ. The Roman Patriarch, by Ecclesiastical Constitu-
tions, might perhaps have a Primacy of Order
among others, the Patriarchs were before them, And
so priests were before them. THE TRUTH
this more powerful Principality the Roman
Bishop had under the Emperors after they
became Christians; and they used the mat-
ter so, that they grew big enough to op-
pose, nay to depose the Emperor, by the
same power which they had given them.
And after this, other Particular Churches,
especially here in the West, submitted them-
selves to them for Succour and Protection
sake. And this was one main cause which
swelled Rome into this more powerful prin-
cipality, and not any Right given by Christ
to make that Prelate Pastor of the whole
Church. I know Bellarmine makes much
no about it, and will needs fetch it out of
S. Augustine, who lays indeed, That in
the Church of Roma there did always flourish
all the long time, that Episcopus was not as much in
charge of the keys, as the Emperor, two and
S. 25. Num. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 687. 688. 689. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 697. 698. 699. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 787. 788. 789. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 797. 798. 799. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 897. 898. 899. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 987. 988. 989. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 997. 998. 999. 999. 1000. 1001. 1002. 1003. 1004. 1005. 1006. 1007. 1008. 1009. 1009. 1010. 1011. 1012. 1013. 1014. 1015. 1016. 1017. 1018. 1019. 1019. 1020. 1021. 1022. 1023. 1024. 1025. 1026. 1027. 1028. 1029. 1029. 1030. 1031. 1032. 1033. 1034. 1035. 1036. 1037. 1038. 1039. 1039. 1040. 1041. 1042. 1043. 1044. 1045. 1046. 1047. 1048. 1049. 1049. 1050. 1051. 1052. 1053. 1054. 1055. 1056. 1057. 1058. 1059. 1059. 1060. 1061. 1062. 1063. 1064. 1065. 1066. 1067. 1068. 1069. 1069. 1070. 1071. 1072. 1073. 1074. 1075. 1076. 1077. 1078. 1079. 1079. 1080. 1081. 1082. 1083. 1084. 1085. 1086. 1087. 1088. 1089. 1089. 1090. 1091. 1092. 1093. 1094. 1095. 1096. 1097. 1097. 1098. 1099. 1099. 1100. 1101. 1102. 1103. 1104. 1105. 1106. 1107. 1108. 1109. 1109. 1110. 1111. 1112. 1113. 1114. 1115. 1116. 1117. 1118. 1119. 1119. 1120. 1121. 1122. 1123. 1124. 1125. 1126. 1127. 1128. 1129. 1129. 1130. 1131. 1132. 1133. 1134. 1135. 1136. 1137. 1138. 1139. 1139. 1140. 1141. 1142. 1143. 1144. 1145. 1146. 1147. 1148. 1149. 1149. 1150. 1151. 1152. 1153. 1154. 1155. 1156. 1157. 1158. 1159. 1159. 1160. 1161. 1162. 1163. 1164. 1165. 1166. 1167. 1168. 1169. 1169. 1170. 1171. 1172. 1173. 1174. 1175. 1176. 1177. 1178. 1179. 1179. 1180. 1181. 1182. 1183. 1184. 1185. 1186. 1187. 1188. 1189. 1189. 1190. 1191. 1192. 1193. 1194. 1195. 1196. 1197. 1197. 1198. 1199. 1199. 1200. 1201. 1202. 1203. 1204. 1205. 1206. 1207. 1208. 1209. 1209. 1210. 1211. 1212. 1213. 1214. 1215. 1216. 1217. 1218. 1219. 1219. 1220. 1221. 1222. 1223. 1224. 1225. 1226. 1227. 1228. 1229. 1229. 1230. 1231. 1232. 1233. 1234. 1235. 1236. 1237. 1238. 1239. 1239. 1240. 1241. 1242. 1243. 1244. 1245. 1246. 1247. 1248. 1249. 1249. 1250. 1251. 1252. 1253. 1254. 1255. 1256. 1257. 1258. 1259. 1259. 1260. 1261. 1262. 1263. 1264. 1265. 1266. 1267. 1268. 1269. 1269. 1270. 1271. 1272. 1273. 1274. 1275. 1276. 1277. 1278. 1279. 1279. 1280. 1281. 1282. 1283. 1284. 1285. 1286. 1287. 1288. 1289. 1289. 1290. 1291. 1292. 1293. 1294. 1295. 1296. 1297. 1297. 1298. 1299. 1299. 1300. 1301. 1302. 1303. 1304. 1305. 1306. 1307. 1308. 1309. 1309. 1310. 1311. 1312. 1313. 1314. 1315. 1316. 1317. 1318. 1319. 1319. 1320. 1321. 1322. 1323. 1324. 1325. 1326. 1327. 1328. 1329. 1329. 1330. 1331. 1332. 1333. 1334. 1335. 1336. 1337. 1338. 1339. 1339. 1340. 1341. 1342. 1343. 1344. 1345. 1346. 1347. 1348. 1349. 1349. 1350. 1351. 1352. 1353. 1354. 1355. 1356. 1357. 1358. 1359. 1359. 1360. 1361. 1362. 1363. 1364. 1365. 1366. 1367. 1368. 1369. 1369. 1370. 1371. 1372. 1373. 1374. 1375. 1376. 1377. 1378. 1379. 1379. 1380. 1381. 1382. 1383. 1384. 1385. 1386. 1387. 1388. 1389. 1389. 1390. 1391. 1392. 1393. 1394. 1395. 1396. 1397. 1397. 1398. 1399. 1399. 1400. 1401. 1402. 1403. 1404. 1405. 1406. 1407. 1408. 1409. 1409. 1410. 1411. 1412. 1413. 1414. 1415. 1416. 1417. 1418. 1419. 1419. 1420. 1421. 1422. 1423. 1424. 1425. 1426. 1427. 1428. 1429. 1429. 1430. 1431. 1432. 1433. 1434. 1435. 1436. 1437. 1438. 1439. 1439. 1440. 1441. 1442. 1443. 1444. 1445. 1446. 1447. 1448. 1449. 1449. 1450. 1451. 1452. 1453. 1454. 1455. 1456. 1457. 1458. 1459. 1459. 1460. 1461. 1462. 1463. 1464. 1465. 1466. 1467. 1468. 1469. 1469. 1470. 1471. 1472. 1473. 1474. 1475. 1476. 1477. 1478. 1479. 1479. 1480. 1481. 1482. 1483. 1484. 1485. 1486. 1487. 1488. 1489. 1489. 1490. 1491. 1492. 1493. 1494. 1495. 1496. 1497. 1497. 1498. 1499. 1499. 1500. 1501. 1502. 1503. 1504. 1505. 1506. 1507. 1508. 1509. 1509. 1510. 1511. 1512. 1513. 1514. 1515. 1516. 1517. 1518. 1519. 1519. 1520. 1521. 1522. 1523. 1524. 1525. 1526. 1527. 1528. 1529. 1529. 1530. 1531. 1532. 1533. 1534. 1535. 1536. 1537. 1538. 1539. 1539. 1540. 1541. 1542. 1543. 1544. 1545. 1546. 1547. 1548. 1549. 1549. 1550. 1551. 1552. 1553. 1554. 1555. 1556. 1557. 1558. 1559. 1559. 1560. 1561. 1562. 1563. 1564. 1565. 1566. 1567. 1568. 1569. 1569. 1570. 1571. 1572. 1573. 1574. 1575. 1576. 1577. 1578. 1579. 1579. 1580. 1581. 1582. 1583. 1584. 1585. 1586. 1587. 1588. 1589. 1589. 1590. 1591. 1592. 1593. 1594. 1595. 1596. 1597. 1597. 1598. 1599. 1599. 1600. 1601. 1602. 1603. 1604. 1605. 1606. 1607. 1608. 1609. 1609. 1610. 1611. 1612. 1613. 1614. 1615. 1616. 1617. 1618. 1619. 1619. 1620. 1621. 1622. 1623. 1624. 1625. 1626. 1627. 1628. 1629. 1629. 1630. 1631. 1632. 1633. 1634. 1635. 1636. 1637. 1638. 1639. 1639. 1640. 1641. 1642. 1643. 1644. 1645. 1646. 1647. 1648. 1649. 1649. 1650. 1651. 1652. 1653. 1654. 1655. 1656. 1657. 1658. 1659. 1659. 1660. 1661. 1662. 1663. 1664. 1665. 1666. 1667. 1668. 1669. 1669. 1670. 1671. 1672. 1673. 1674. 1675. 1676. 1677. 1678. 1679. 1679. 1680. 1681. 1682. 1683. 1684. 1685. 1686. 1687. 1688. 1689. 1689. 1690. 1691. 1692. 1693. 1694. 1695. 1696. 1697. 1697. 1698. 1699. 1699. 1700. 1701. 1702. 1703. 1704. 1705. 1706. 1707. 1708. 1709. 1709. 1710. 1711. 1712. 1713. 1714. 1715. 1716. 1717. 1718. 1719. 1719. 1720. 1721. 1722. 1723. 1724. 1725. 1726. 1727. 1728. 1729. 1729. 1730. 1731. 1732. 1733. 1734. 1735. 1736. 1737. 1738. 1739. 1739. 1740. 1741. 1742. 1743. 1744. 1745. 1746. 1747. 1748. 1749. 1749. 1750. 1751. 1752. 1753. 1754. 1755. 1756. 1757. 1758. 1759. 1759. 1760. 1761. 1762. 1763. 1764. 1765. 1766. 1767. 1768. 1769. 1769. 1770. 1771. 1772. 1773. 1774. 1775. 1776. 1777. 1778. 1779. 1779. 1780. 1781. 1782. 1783. 1784. 1785. 1786. 1787. 1788. 1789. 1789. 1790. 1791. 1792. 1793. 1794. 1795. 1796. 1797. 1797. 1798. 1799. 1799. 1800. 1801. 1802. 1803. 1804. 1805. 1806. 1807. 1808. 1809. 1809. 1810. 1811. 1812. 1813. 1814. 1815. 1816. 1817. 1818. 1819. 1819. 1820. 1821. 1822. 1823. 1824. 1825. 1826. 1827. 1828. 1829. 1829. 1830. 1831. 1832. 1833. 1834. 1835. 1836. 1837. 1838. 1839. 1839. 1840. 1841. 1842. 1843. 1844. 1845. 1846. 1847. 1848. 1849. 1849. 1850. 1851. 1852. 1853. 1854. 1855. 1856. 1857. 1858. 1859. 1859. 1860. 1861. 1862. 1863. 1864. 1865. 1866. 1867. 1868. 1869. 1869. 1870. 1871. 1872. 1873. 1874. 1875. 1876. 1877. 1878. 1879. 1879. 1880. 1881. 1882. 1883. 1884. 1885. 1886. 1887. 1888. 1889. 1889. 1890. 1891. 1892. 1893. 1894. 1895. 1896. 1897. 1897. 1898. 1899. 1899. 1900. 1901. 1902. 1903. 1904. 1905. 1906. 1907. 1908. 1909. 1909. 1910. 1911. 1912. 1913. 1914. 1915. 1916. 1917. 1918. 1919. 1919. 1920. 1921. 1922. 1923. 1924. 1925. 1926. 1927. 1928. 1929. 1929. 1930. 1931. 1932. 1933. 1934. 1935. 1936. 1937. 1938. 1939. 1939. 1940. 1941. 1942. 1943. 1944. 1945. 1946. 1947. 1948. 1949. 1949. 1950. 1951. 1952. 1953. 1954. 1955. 1956. 1957. 1958. 1959. 1959. 1960. 1961. 1962. 1963. 1964. 1965. 1966. 1967. 1968. 1969. 1969. 1970. 1971. 1972. 1973. 1974. 1

the Principality of an Apostolike Chair: Or, if you will, the Apostolike Chair, in relation to the West and South parts of the Church, all the other four Apostolike Chairs being in the East. Now this no man denies, that understands the state and story

* Quia Opinio invaserit fundatam esse hanc Ecclesiam à S. Petro; itaque in Occidente Sedes Apostolica Honora causa vocatur. Calv. L. 4. c. 6. S. 16.

† Princeps Ecclesie. S. Hilari. 1.8. ad. Mm. Pria. And he speaks of a Bishop in general. Grig. Nazianz. Ora. 17. Abor- bunt Episcopo duxysca illua, & auctor Imperium, Thronum, & Principatus regi- ginae Animarum. Et credamus Dicte, bujusmodi Imperium. And he also speaks of a Bishop, Grig. Nazianz. Ora. 20. Nor were there any Titles of pride in Bishops then. For S. Greg. Nazianz. who challenges these Titles to himself, Ora. 17. was to devout, to mild, and to humili- able, that rather than the Peace of the Church should be broken, he freely ren- signed the Great Patriarchate of Con- stantinople, and retired: and this in the First Council of Constantinople, and the Second General.

¶ Here to give power here to give power (which God knows were far short of the whole Church) I shall make it most manifest out of the very same Epistle. For afterwards (saith S. Augustine) when the pertinacie of his Donatists could not be restrained by the African Bishops only, || they gave them leave to be heard by foreign Bishops. And after that he hath these words: * And yet peradventure Mel- ciades the Bishop of the Roman Church, with his Colleagues, the Transmarine Bishops, non debuit, ought not usurp to him- self, nisi Judgment which was determin- ed by seventy African Bishops, Tigisitanus fitting Primate. And what will you say, if he did not usurp this Power? For the Em- peror being desired, sent Bishops Judges,

(... Personae et Prelates, quae transmarinis Ecclesiis Transmarinis. S. Aug. Ep. 16a.

* ac forte non debuit. Romane Prelate Melciades Episcopus cum College trans- marine Episcopi illud sibi usurpari judi- cavit quod ab Africis usurpatum, ut Pri- matus Tigisitanus propositi, fuisse certi- tam? Quid quod ut sit usurpatum? Ne- gatius quippe Imperator, Judicis nisi Epi- scopis, qui cum eo iuraverint. Quod deinde illa Causa, quod iustum videtur, sum- venit, Ora. S. Aug. 17d.

which should sit with him, and determine what was just upon the whole Cause. In which Passage there are very many things Obscure. As first, that the Roman Prelate came not in, till there was leave for them to go to Transmarine Bishops. Sec- ondly, that if the Pope had come in without this Leave, it had been an Usurpation. Thirdly, that when he did thus come in, not by his own Proper Authority, but by Leave, there were other Bishops made Judges with him. Fourthly,

that

that these other Bishops were appointed, and sent by the Emperor and his Power ; that which the Pope will least of all indure.

Lastly, lest the Pope and his *Adherents* should say this was an

Usurpation in the Emperor, * S. Aug. tells

us a little before, in the same Epistle still,

* *Ad cuius curam, de qua rationem Do*vid* redditum est, ut illa maxime periret.*

S. Aug. Epist. 162.

that this doth chiefly belong ad Curam ejus,

to the Emperors Care and charge, and that

He is to give an Account to God for it. And Melciades did sit

and Judge the Business with all Christian Prudence and Moderation.

So at this time the *Roman Prelate* was not received as

Pastor of the whole Church, say A.C. what he please. Nor had he

any *Supremacie* over the other *Patriarchs* : And for this, were

all other *Records of Antiquity* silent, the *Civil Law* is proof

enough, (And that's a Monument of the *Primitive Church*.)

The Text there is, † *A Patriarcha non da-*

tur Appellatio. From a *Patriarch* there lies

no Appeal. No Appeal. Therefore every

Patriarch was alike Supreme in his own *Pa-*

triarchate. Therefore the *Pope* then had no

Supremacie over the *whole Church*. There-

fore certainly not then received as *Univer-*

sal Pastor. And S. *Gregory* himself speak-

ing of *Appeals*, and expressly citing the

Laws themselves, says plainly, * *That the*

Patriarch is to put a final end to those Ca-

ses, which came before him by Appeal from

Bishops and Archbishops : but then he adds,

† *That where there is nor Metropolitan, nor*

Patriarch of that Diocese, there they are to

have recourse to the Sea Apostolike, as being

the Head of all Churches. Where first this im-

plies plainly, That if there be a *Metropoli-*

tan, or a Patriarch in those Churches, his

Judgment is final ; and there ought to be no appeal to Rome.

Secondly, Tis as

plain, That in those Ancient times of the Church-Govern-

ment, *Britain* was never subject to the *Sea of Rome*. For it was

one of the || *Six Dioceses of the West*

Empire, and had a *Primate* of its own :

Nay, * *John Capgrave*, one of your own,

and Learned for those times, and long be-

fore him *William of Malmesbury* tell us,

that *Pope Urban the second*, at the Council

held at *Bari* in *Apulia*, accounted my Wor-

thy Predecessor S. *Anselm*, as his own Com-

peer, and said he was as the *Apostolike*, and

Patriarch of the other world. (So he then termed this Island.)

Now the *Britains* having a *Primate* of their own (which is

greater

† *Nam contra horum Antifitum (de Pa-*

triarchis loquitur) Sententia, non esse

Appellacioni à Majoribus nostris

constitutum est. Cod. L. 1. Tit. 4. L. 29. ex

editione Gothofredi. Si non rata habuerit

urisque Paris, que Judicata sunt, tunc

Bratissimus Patriarcha Diacones illius,

inter eos andat, &c. Nulla parte ejus

Sententie curandum valente. Auben-

Colat. 9. Tit. 14. C. 22.

* *Et ille (scilicet Patriarcha) secundum*

canonis, & Legis prebeat finem. And

there he cites the Novel its self. S. Greg

L. 1.1. Indict. 8. Epist. 34.

† *Si diuum fuerit, quod nec Metropoli-*

tatum habeat, nec Patriarcham : dicen-

dum est, quod à Sede Apostolica, que om-

nium Ecclesiarum Caput est, causa audiend

a est, &c. S. Greg. Ibid.

|| *Nuptia Provinciarum Occidentalium.*

Guidum Panciroolum, l. 2. c. 48.

* *Hunc canitis Liberarium Artium disci-*

pilum eruditum pro Magistro tentamus,

& quasi comparem, velut alterius Orbis

Apostolicarum Patriarcham, &c. Jo. Cap-

gravius ac. Nupti Sanctorum, in vita S.

Anselmi. Et Gall. Malmesburiens. de

Caſta Prodigia Anglorum, p. 223. Edit.

Franc. 1691.

* Ibi (Cantuarie id est) prima Sedes Arciepiscopi habetur, qui est totius Anglie Primas & Patriarcha. Guil. Malmesburyensis in Prolog. Lib. 1. de Gestis Pontificum Anglorum, p. 195.

es then in the World, which were not under some either Patriarch, or Metropolitan. Fourthly, if any such were, 'tis gratis dictum, and impossible to be proved, that all such Churches, where ever seated in the world, were obliged to depend on Rome. For manifest it is, that the Bishops which were Ordained in places without the Limits of the Roman Empire (which places they commonly called * Barbarous) were all to be Ordained, and therefore most probable to be governed by the Patriarch of Constantinople. And for Rome's being the Head of all Churches, I have said enough to that in divers parts of this Discourse.

* Primitus & qui fuit in eis Bapca- eensis, in Barbarico, Epis- copi a Sa- cissimo Thro- so Sacerdifice mea Constantinopolitana Ecclesie Ordinavitur. Codex Canonum Ecclesiae universitatis, Cap. 205. And Julianus proves it there at large, that by *in Barbaricis*, in that Canon, is meant *in Solo Barbarorum*. Annot. Ibid.

NUM. II. And since I am thus fallen upon the Church of Africk, I shall borrow another reason from the Practice of that Church, why by Principatus, S. Augustine neither did, nor could mean any Principality of the Church, or Bishop of Rome over the Whole Church of Christ. For as the Acts of Councils and Stories go, the African Prelates finding that all succeeding Popes were not of Melciades his temper, set themselves to assert their own Liberties, and held it out stoutly against Zozimus, Boniface the first, and Celestine the first, who were successively Popes of Rome. At last it was concluded in the sixth Council of Carthage (wherein were assembled two hundred and seventeen Bishops, of which S. Augustine himself was one) that they would not give way to such a manifest incroachment upon their Rights and Liberties ; and thereupon gave present notice to Pope Celestine to forbear sending his Officers amongst them, * lest he should seem to induce the swelling pride of the world into the Church of Christ. And this is said to have amounted into a formal Separation from the Church of Rome, and to have continued

* Ne sumus typhon seculi in Ecclesiam Christi videatur inducere, &c. Epist. consil. Afric. ad Papam Celestimum Primatum. Apud Nicolin. Tom. 1. Concil. p. 844.

for the space of somewhat more than one hundred years. Now that such a Separation there was of the African Church from Rome, and a Reconciliation after, stands upon the Credit and Authority of two publike Instruments extant both among the Ancient Councils. The one is an Epistle from Boniface the Second, in whose time the Reconciliation to Rome is said to be made by Enslius then Bishop of Carthage, but the Separation,

+ Epist. Boni- facii 2. apud Nicolin. Tom. 2. Concil. p. 544.

instigante Diabolo, by the Temptation of the Devil. The other is an * *Exemplar Precum*, or Copy of the *Petition* of the same *Eulalius*, in which he damns and curses all those his Predecessors which went against the *Church of Rome*. Amongst which *Eulalius* must needs Curse S. *Augustine*; And Pope *Boniface* accepting this *Submission*; must acknowledge that S. *Augustine* and the rest of that Council deserved this Curse, and dyed under it, as violating *Reit & Fidei Regulam*, the Rule of the Right Faith (so the *Exemplar Precum* begins) by refusing the *Popes* Authority. I will not deny, but that there are divers Reasons given by the *Learned Romanists* and *Reformed Writers* for and against the *Truth* and *Authority* of both these *Instruments*. But because this is too long to be examin'd here, I will say but this, and then make my use of it to my present purpose, giving the *Church of Rome* free leave to acknowledge these *Instruments* to be true or false, as they please. That which I shall say, is this: These *Instruments* are let stand in all Editions of the *Councils* and *Epistles Decretal*: As for Example, in the Old Edition by *Isidor*, Anno 1524. And in another Old Edition of them Printed, Anno 1530. And in that which was published by *P. Crabbe*, Anno 1538. And in the Edition of *Valentinus Joverius*, Anno 1555. And in that by *Surius*, Anno 1567. And in the Edition at *Venice* by *Nicolinus*, Anno 1585. And in all of these without any Note, or Censure upon them. And they are in the Edition of *Binius* too, Anno 1618. but there's a Censure upon them, to keep a quarrel it may be with † *Baroniis*, who was the first (I think) that ever quarrelled them, and he doth it tartly. And since || *Bellarmino* follows the same way, but more doubtfully. This is that which I had to say. And the Use which I shall make of these *Instruments*, whether they be true or false, is this. They are either true or false, that is of necessity. If they be false, then *Boniface the Second*, and his Accomplices at *Rome*, or some for them, are notorious *Forgers*, and that of *Records* of great *Consequence* concerning the Government and Peace of the whole *Church of Christ*, and to the perpetual Infamy of that *Sea*; and all this foolishly, and to no purpose. For if there were no such separation, as these *Records* mention of the *African Churches* from the *Roman*, to what end should *Boniface*, or any other, counterfeit an Epistle of his own, and a *Submission* of *Eulalius*? On the other side, if these *Instruments* be true (as the *sixth Council of Carthage* against all other Arguments makes me incline to believe they are, in Substance at least, though

¶ Valde nibi ille Epistola suspirare sunt;
Bellar. L.2. de Rom. Pont. c. 25. S. Re-
spondeo primum. Sed si forte ille E-
pistola vero sunt, nihil enim affirmo, &c.
Ibid. S. alt.

though perhaps not in all Circumstances) then 'tis manifest, that the *Church of Africk* separated from the *Church of Rome*; That this Separation continued above one hundred years; That the *Church of Africk* made this Separation in a *National Council* of their own, which had in it two hundred and seventeen Bishops: That this Separation was made (for ought appears) only because they at *Rome* were too ready to entertain Appeals from the *Church of Africk*, as appears in the Case of

* *Apianus*, who then appealed thither:

* And so the Council of *Carthage* sent word to Pope *Calestine* plainly, that in admitting such Appeals, he brake the Decrees of the Council of *Nicæa*. Epist. Concil. Africa. ad. Calestini, c. 105. A. pnd. Nicæa. Tom. I. Concil. p. 844.

then these Famous Fathers of the Church dyed (for ought appears) in *Arian* and *unrepented Schism*,

† *Planct ex Ecclesia Catholica abo Ex-pungenda sufficiens Sardicanum Africarum Martyrum Agmina qui in persecutions Vandalaica pro Fide Catholica &c. Baron. An. 419. Num. 93. Et Bonius. In Nota ad Epist. Bonifacii 2. ad Eulalium.*

+ and out of the *Church*. And if so, then how comes *S. Augustine* to be, and be accounted a *Saint* all over the Christian world, and at *Rome* it self? But if the separation were just, then is it far more law-

* S. 24. N. 5. full for the *Church of England* by a *National Council* to cast off the *Popes Usurpation* (as * She did) then it was for the *African Church* to separate; Because then the *African Church* excepted only against the *Pride of Rome* + in Case of Appeals, and two other *Canons* less material; But the *Church of England* excepts (besides this Grievance) against many *Corruptions in Doctrine* belonging to the *Faith*, with which *Rome* at that time of the *African Separation* was not tainted. And I am out of all doubt, that *S. Augustine* and those other *Famous men* in their generations, durst not thus have separated from *Rome*, had the *Pope* had that powerful *Principality* over the whole *Church of Christ*; And that by *Christ's own Ordinance* and Institution, as *A. C.* pretends he had.

N U M. 12. I told you a little * before, that the *Popes* grew under the Emperors, till they had over-grown them. And now lest *A. C.* should say, I speak it without proof, I will give you a brief touch of the *Church-story* in that behalf: And that from the beginning of the *Emperors becoming Christians*, to the time of *Charles the Great*, which contains about five hundred years. For so soon as the *Emperors* became Christian, the *Church* (which before was kept under by Persecutions) began to be put in better Order. For the calling and Authority of *Bishops* over the Inferior *Clergy*, that was a thing of known use, and benefit for Preservation of Unity and Peace in the *Church*. And so much

* S. 25. N. 10.

much * S. Jerome tells us, Though being none himself, he was no great friend to *Bishops*. And this was so settled in the minds of men from the very *Infancie of the Christian Church*, as that it had not been to that time contradicted by any. So that then there was no Controversie about the *Calling*; all agreed upon that. The only Difficulty was to accommodate the *Places* and *Precedencies* of *Bishops*, among themselves, for the very Necessity of *Order* and *Government*. To do this, the most equal and impartial way was, *That as the Church is in the Common-wealth, not the Common-wealth in it* (as † Optatus tells us:) So the *Honors of the Church* should || follow the *Honors of the State*. And so it was insinuated, if not Ordered (as appears) by the Canons of the *Councils of Chalcedon* and *Antioch*. And this was the very fountain of *Papal Greatness*, the *Pope* having his Residence in the great *Imperial City*. But *Precedencie* is one thing, and *Authority* is another. It was thought fit therefore, though (as * S. Cyprian speaks) *Episcopatus unus est*; the *Calling* of a *Bishop* be one and the same, that yet among *Bishops* there should be a certain *Subordination* and *Subjection*. The *Empire* therefore being cast into several Divisions (which they then called *Dioeceses*) every *Dioecess* contained several *Provinces*, every *Province* several *Bishopricks*. The *Chief* of a *Dioecess* (in that larger sense) was called *Exarchus*, and sometimes a *Patriarch*. The *Chief* of a *Province*, a *Metropolitane*. Next the *Bishops* in their several *Dioeceses* (as we now use that word.) Among *These* there was *effectual subjection* respectively grounded upon *Canon*, and *Positive Law*, in their several Quarters. But over them none at all. All the Difference there, was but *Honorary*, not *Authoritative*. If the Ambition of some particular persons did attempt now and then to break these Bounds, it is no marvel. For no *Calling* can sanctifie all that have it. And *Socrates* tells us, *That in this way the Bishops of Alexandria and Rome advanced themselves to a great height* *τηρεῖσθαι τὸν ἀπόρριψιν*, even beyond the quality of *Bishops*. Now upon view of *Story* it will appear, that what advantage accrued to *Alexandria*, was gotten by the violence of *Theophilus*, *Patriarch* there. A man of exceeding great Learning, and of no less violence; and he made no little advantage, out of this, that the Empress *Endoxia* used his help for the casting of S. *Chrysostome* out of *Constantinople*. But the *Roman Prelates* grew by a steady and constant watchfulness upon all Occasions

* Quid autem postea datus electus est qui ecclesia proponeretur, in Schismatis remedium factum est, ut unusquisque ad se trahens Christi Ecclesiam rumpet. Nam & Alexandria & Marco Evangelista Presbyteri semper unum ex se claram in excellitiori gradu colligatum Episcopum nominabant, &c. S. Hieron. in Epist. ad Evaragium. So even according to S. Hieron, Bishops had a very ancient and honourable descent in the Church from S. Mark the Evangelist. And about the end of the same Epistle, he acknowledges it. Traditionem esse apostolicam. Nay, more then so, He affirms plainly, That ubi non est Sacerdos, non est Ecclesia. S. Hieron. advers. Luciferian. And in that place most manifest it is that S. Ieron by *Sacerdos* means a Bishop. For he speaks de Sacerdoti qui postea sibi ordinari, which in S. Ierons own Judgment no meer Priest had, but a Bishop only. S. Hier. Epist. ad Evaragium. So even with him, no Bishop, and no Church.
† Non enim Rsp. est in Ecclesia: sed Eccl. est in Rsp. Optat. L. 3.
¶ Conc. Calcedon. 9. & Actio 16.

* S. Cyprian.
L. de Simp.
Prelat.

casions to increase the Honour of that Sea. Interposing and
 * assuming to themselves to be Vindictors of the Canons (as S. Grego-
 ry Nazian. speaks) Defenders and Restorers of the Canons of
 the Church, which was a fair pretence, and took extremely
 well. But yet the World took notice of this their aim. For
 in all Contested between the East and the West, which were
 nor small nor few, the Western Bishops objected Levity to the
 Eastern; And they again Arrogance to the Bishops of the West,
 as [†] Eilim observes, and upon very war-
 rantable Testimonies. For all this, the Bi-
 Bishop of Rome continued in good Obedience
 to the Emperor, enduring his Censures
 and Judgments. And being chosen by the
 Clergy and People of Rome, he accepted from the Emperor
 the Ratification of that choice. Inasmuch that about the year
 579. when all Italy was on fire with the Lombards, and
 * Pelagius the Second constrained through
 the necessity of the times, contrary to the
 Example of his Predecessors, to enter upon
 the Papedom without the Emperors leave; S. Gregory then a Deacon was shortly after
 sent on Embassie to excuse it. About this
 time brake out the Ambition of || John Pa-
 triarch of Constantinople affecting to be U-
 niversal Bishop.

He was countenanced in this by Mauricius the
 Emperor, but powerfully opposed by Pelagius and S. Gregory. In-
 somuch that S. * Gregory says plainly, That
 this Pride of his shews that the times of An-
 tichrist were near. So as yet (and this was
 now upon the point of six hundred years
 after Christ) there was no Universal Bishop. No one Monarch
 over the whole Militant Church.

+ It may be they will say S. Gregory did not inveigh against
 the Thing, but the Person. That John of Constantinople should
 take that upon him, which belonged to the Pope. But it is
 manifest by S. Gregory's own Text, that he speaks against the
 Thing itself, that neither the Bishop of Rome, nor any other
 ought to take on him that title. *Cura tuus Ecclesie & Prin-
 cipatus S. Petri constitutus, et ramae Hieronimis Apolonus non
 vocatur. S. Greg. L. 4. Epis. 76.* (Therefore neither is his
 Successor, Universal Bishop.) *Nuquid erat in re propria
 causam defendere? nequid speciem infusum vendicere? & non
 magis causam Omnipotentis Dei & Universali Ecclesie? where he
 plainly denies, that he speaks in his own Cause, or in the
 Cause of his Sea. *Pax Constantiopolitana Chalcidonum Synodus votum Nomen Rom. Pontifici oblationem est, sed nullus
 eorum unquam hoc Augmentatione Vocabulum assumpsit, nec uti constat, ne dum pietatum aliquid duxerit nisi, ho-
 nore debito Sacerdotes praevaricari universi. &c.* Where he plainly says, the Roman Bishops rejected this
 Title. *Ibid.* And yet for all this Pope Gregory the Seventh delivers it as one of his Dictates in a Council held
 at Rome about the year 1076. *Quod sius Romanus Pontifex pote dicatur Universalis. Baron. ad An. 1076.
 Num. 31 & 32.**

*Ab sit a Cardine Christianorum Nomen istud Blasphemia. S. Greg. L. 4. Epis. 76. In isto scelito vocabulo
 consentire, nihil est aliud quam fidem perdere. S. Greg. L. 4. Epis. 76.*

O He nōc dñm dñm dñm lñ vñlñs vñlñs
 sñlñs

way either those two Popes, *Pelagius* and *S. Gregory* erred in this weighty busines about an *Universal Bishop* over the whole Church ; Or if they did not Erre, *Boniface*, and the rest which after him took it upon them, were in their very *Predecessors* judgment, *Antichristian*. But to proceed. * As yet the right of *Election* or *Ratification* of the Pope continued in the *Emperor*. But then the *Lombards* grew so great in Italy, and the *Empire* was so infested with *Saracens* ; and such changes hapned in all parts of the world, as that neither for the present, the *Homage* of the Pope was useful to the *Emperor*, nor the *Protection* of the *Emperor* available for the Pope. By this means the *Bishop of Rome* was left to play his own game by himself. A thing which as it pleased him well enough ; So both he, and his Successors made great Advantage by it. For being grown to that *Eminence* by the *Emperor*, and the greatness of that City and Place of his abode, He found himself the more free, the greater the tempest was, that beat upon the other : And then first, † He set himself to alienate the hearts of the *Italians* from the *Emperor*. Next he Opposed himself against him. And about the year seven hundred and ten, Pope *Constantine* the first did also first of all openly confront *Philippicus* the *Emperor* in defence of *Images*. As || *Onophrius* tells us. After him * *Gregory the Second*, and the *third* took up his example, and did the like by *Leo Isaurus*. By this time the *Lombards* began to pinch very close, and to vex on all sides not *Italy* only, but *Rome* too. This drives the Pope to seek a new *Patron*. And very fitly he meets with *Charles Martel* in *France*, that famous warrior against the *Saracens*. * Him he implores in defence of the Church against the *Lombards*. This address seems very advisedly taken, at least it proves very fortunate to them both. † For in short time it dissolved the Kingdom of the *Lombards* in *Italy*, which had then stood two hundred and four years, which was the Popes security ; And it brought the *Crown of France* into the House of *Charles*, and shortly after the *Western Empire*. And now began the Pope to be great indeed. For by the Bounty of || *Pipin Son of Charles*, that which was taken from the *Lombards* was given to the Pope. So that now of a *Bishop*, he became a *Temporal Prince*. But when *Charles the Great* had set up the *Western*

* Vana tunc
bebatur Ce-
ri & Populi
Ecclesia, nisi
aut Imperato-
res, aut eorum
Exarchi con-
firmasset. Plat.
is vita Seve-
rini 1.

† Quum Theophylactus Exarchus Impera-
toris Italianum pueri, Milites Itali, veriti-
te quid maius ius Adventus portenderet,
quod superioribus temporibus sepe magis cum
Pontificibus quam cum Imperatoribus sen-
tissent, ingressum Romanum interficere con-
stituerant. (And the Emperors own
Governor was fain to be defended from
the Emperors own Soldiers by the
Popes power, who had gotten Interest
in them against their own Master.) Plat.
is vita Johan. 6. Abismarus was
then Emperor.

|| Primus omnium Rom. Pontificum Impe-
ratori Grato Philippico in as resiliere pa-
lam aquis est. Onaph. in Plat. is vita
Constantini 1.

* Platina in vita Gregor. 2 & 3.

* ut laborasti Roma & Ecclesie primo
quoque tempore auxilium ferret, &c. Platin.
is vita Greg. 3.

† Queris semel inculta cum Longobardi-
ci Regni excidio fruta est. Onaph. in
Plat. is vita Constantini Primi.

|| Radij itaque Romam Exarchatus est,
quicquid Padum & Apenninum interjacet,
&c. Plat. is vita Stephan. Secundi.

Western Empire, then he resumed the Ancient and Original Power of the Emperor, to govern the Church, to call Councils, to order Papal Elections. And this Power continued in his Posteriority. For this Right of the Emperor was in force and use

* Imperator in gratiam cum Gregorio redit, tandemque in Pontificatum confirmavit, ut tam Imperatorum nos erat. Plat. in vita Gregor. spirit.

in Gregory the Seventh's time, * Who was confirmed in the Papedom by Henry the fourth, whom he afterward deposed. And it might have continued longer, if the succeeding Emperors had had abilities enough

to secure, or vindicate their own Right. But the Pope keeping a strong Council about him, and meeting with some Weak Princes, and they oft-times distracted with great and dangerous Wars, grew stronger, till he got the better. So this is enough to shew how the Popes climed up by the Emperors, till they over-topped them; which is all I said before, and have now proved. And this was about the year 1073. (For the whole Papedom of Gregory the Seventh was begun and ended within the Reign of William the Conqueror.) Yet was it carried in succeeding times with great changes of fortune, and different success.

The Emperor sometimes plucking from the Pope, and the Pope from the Emperor, winning and losing ground, as their Spirits, Abilities, Aids and Opportunities were, till at the last the Pope settled himself upon the Grounds laid by || Gregory the Seventh, in the great power which he now uses in and over these parts of the Christian world.

¶ For in a Synod at Rome about the year 1076. Pope Gregory the Seventh established certain brief Conclusions, twenty seven in number, upon which stands almost all the Greatness of the Papacy. These Conclusions are called *Dicitatus Papae*. And they are reckoned up by Baronius in the year 1076. No. 31, 32, &c. But whether this Dictatorship did now first invade the Church, I cannot certainly say. The chief of these Propositions follow here.

Quod solus Rom. Pontifex jure dicatur Universalis.

Quod solum Papa petis omnes Principes deponentur.

Quod licet illi Imperatores Depogetur.

Quod nulla Synodus absque precepto eius debet Generalia vocari.

Quod nullum Capitulum, nullusque Liber Canonicus habeatur absque illius Autoritate.

Quod sententia illius a nullo debet retractari, & ipse omnium solus retractare potest.

Quod Rom. Ecclesia unquam erravit, nec in perpetuum, Scriptura testante, errabit.

Quod Rom. Pontifex, si Caenice fuerit ordinatus, meritum B. Petri indubitate efficitur sanctus.

Quod a fidelitate Iniquorum subdites potest absolvere.

NUM. 13.

Thirdly, A.C. knowing 'tis not enough to say this, *That the Pope is Pastor of the whole Church*, labors to prove it. And first he tells us, *that Irenæus intimates so much*; but he doth not tell us where. And he is much scantied of *Ancient Proof*, if Irenæus stand alone. Besides, Irenæus was a Bishop of the Gallicane Church, and a very unlikely man to Captivate the Liberty of that Churh under the more powerful Principality of Rome. And how can we have better evidence of his Judgment touching that Principality, than the Actions of his Life? When Pope Victor Excommunicated the Asian Churches about,

* all

* all at a blow, was not *Irenæus* the Chief man that reprehended him for it? A very unmeet and undutiful thing, sure, if had been in *Irenæus*, in deeds to tax him of rashnes and inconsideratenes, whom in words *A. C.* would have to be acknowledged by him, *The Supreme and Infallible Pastor of the Universal Church*. But the Place of *Irenæus*, which *A. C.* means, (I think) is this, where he uses these words indeed, but short of *A. C.*'s sense of it. † *To this Church* (he speaks of *Rome*) propter potentiorēm principaliatēm, for the more powerful Principality of it, 'tis necessary that every Church, that is, the faithful, undique, round about, should have recourse. Should have recourse, to *A. C.* translates it. And what doth this avail him? Very *A. C.* p. 58. great reason was there in *Irenæus* his time, That upon any Difference arising in the Faith, Omnes undique Fideles, all the Faithful, or, if you will, all the Churches round about, should have recourse, that is, resort to *Rome*, being the Imperial City, and so a Church of more powerful Principality, than any other at that time in those parts of the world. Well: Will this exalt *Rome* to be the Head of the Church Universal? What if the States and Policies of the world be much changed since, and this Conveniencie of resorting to *Rome* be quite ceased? Then is not *Rome* devested of her more powerful Principality? But the meaning of *A. C.* is, We must so have recourse to *Rome*, as to submit our Faith to hers: And then not only in *Irenæus* his time, but through all times reform Ourselves by her Rule: That is, all the Faithful, not undique, round about, but ubique, every where, must agree with *Rome* in point of Faith. This he means, and *Rome* may thank him for it. But this *Irenæus* saith not, nor will his words bear it; nor durst *A. C.* therefore construe him so, but was content to smooth it over with this ambiguous phrase of having recourse to *Rome*. Yet this is a place as much stood upon by them, as any other in all Antiquity. And should I grant them their own sense, that all the faithful every where must agree with *Rome* (which I may give, but can never grant) yet were not this saying any whit prejudicial to us now. For first, here's a powerful Principality ascribed to the Church of *Rome*. And that no man of Learning doubts but the Church of *Rome* had within its own Patriarchate and Jurisdiction; and that was very large, containing || Ed. Brit. wood, of the all the Provinces in the Diocese of Italy (in the old sense of Jurisdiction the word Diocese) which Provinces the Lawyers and others term Suburbicarias. There were ten of them. The three Islands, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia; and the other seven upon the firm land of Italy. And this (I take it) is plain in *Buffinus*. For he living shortly after the Nicene Council, as 1. M.S. he

* Euseb. L. 5.
c. 25.
† Ad hanc Ecclesiam, propter potentiorēm Principaliatēm, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam; i. e. eos qui sunt undique fidèles: In quā semper ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea que est ab Apollō lī traditū. Iren. L. 2. c. 3.

he did, and being of Italy, as he was, he might very well know the Bounds of that Patriarchs Jurisdiction, as it was then

** Apud Alexandriam, ut in urbe Româ
vetusta confutatio servetur, ut ille Egyp-
ti, ut hic Suburbicariorum Ecclesiarum fa-
licitudinem gerat. Ruffin. L. I. Eccles.
Hist. c. 6.*

† Peron L. 2. of his Reply, c. 6.

practised : * And he says expressly, That according to the old Custome, the Roman Patriarchs Charge was confined within the Limits of the Suburbicarian Churches. To avoid the force of this Testimony, † Cardinal Peron lays load upon Ruffinus. For he

charges him with Passion, Ignorance, and Rashness. And one piece of his Ignorance is, That he hath ill translated the Canon of the Council of Nice. Now be that as it may, I neither do, nor can approve his Translation of that Canon ; nor can it be easily proved, that he purposely intended a Translation. All that I urge is, that Ruffinus living in that time and Place, was very like well to know and understand the Limits and Bounds of that Patriarchate of Rome, in which he lived. Secondly here's, That it had potentiores, a more powerful Principality than other Churches had. And that the Protestants grant too ; and that not only because the Roman Prelate was Ordine pri-
mus, first in Order, and Degree, which some One must be, to

*¶ Quia cum Orientales & Graecæ Ecclesiæ,
& Africane etiam, multis inter se Opini-
num dissensionibus tumultuaruntur, nec se-
dator alius, & minus turbulenta fuit.
Calv. L. 4. Instit. c. 6. S. 16.*

avoid Confusion ; || But also because the Roman See had won a great deal of Credit, and gained a great deal of Power to it self in Church-Affairs : Because while the Greek
yea, and the African Churches too, were turbulent, and distracted with many and dangerous Opinions, the Church of Rome all that while, and a good while after Irenæus too, was more calm and constant to the Truth. Thirdly, here's a Necessity (say they) required, That every Church, that is, the faithful, which are every where, agree with that Church. But what ? simply with that Church, what ever it do or believe ? No, nothing less. For Irenæus adds, with that Church, in qua, in which is conserved that Tradition which was delivered by the Apostles. And God forbid but it should be necessary for all Churches ; and all the faithful to agree with that Ancient Apostolike Church in all those Things, in which it keeps to the Doctrine and Discipline delivered by the Apostles. In Irenæus his time it kept these better than any other Church, and by this in part obtained potentiores Principialitatem, a Greater power than other Churches, but not over all other Churches. And (as they understand Irenæus) a Necessity lay upon all other Churches to agree with this : but this Necessity was laid upon them by the Then Integrity of the Christian Faith there profes-
sed, not by the Universality of the Roman Jurisdiction now challenged. And let Rome reduce it self to the Observation of Tradition Apostolike, to which it then held, and I will say as Irenæus did ; That it will be then necessary for every Church, and

and for the Faithful every where, to agree with it. Lastly, let me Observe too, That *Irenaeus* made no doubt, but that *Rome* might fall away from *Apostolical Tradition*, as well as other Particular Churches of great Name have done. For he does not say, *in quā servanda semper erit, sed in quā servata est*: Not, in which Church the Doctrine delivered from the Apostles shall ever be entirely kept: That had been *home* indeed: But in which, by God's Grace and Mercy, it was to that time of *Irenaeus* so kept and preserved. So we have here in *Irenaeus* his Judgment, the *Church of Rome* then Entire, but not *Infallible*. And endowed with a more powerful Principality than other Churches, but not with an Universal Dominion over all other Churches; which is the Thing in Question.

But to this place of *Irenaeus A.C.* joyns a Reason of his own. N. U. M. 14.
A. C. p. 58.
For he tells us the *Bishop of Rome* is *S. Peter's Successor*, and therefore to *Him* we must have recourse. The Fathers, I deny not, ascribe very much to *S. Peter*: But 'tis to *S. Peter* in his own person. And among them, *Epiphanius* is as free, and as frequent in extolling *S. Peter*, as any of them: And yet did he never intend to give an Absolute Principality to *Rome* in *S. Peter's right*. There is a Noted Place in that Father, where his words are these: * *For the Lord himself made S. Peter the first of the Apostles, a firm Rock, upon which the Church of God is built, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, &c.* For in him the Faith is made firm every way, who received the Key of Heaven, &c. For in him all the Questions and Subtilties of the Faith are found. This is a great Place at first sight too, and deserves a Marginal Note to call young Readers eyes to view it. And it hath this Note in the Old Latine Edition at *Paris*, 1564. *Petri Principatus, & Præstantia*; Peters Principality, and Excellensie. This Place, as much shew as it makes for the *Roman Principality*, I shall easily clear, and yet do no wrong, either to *S. Peter*, or the *Roman Church*. For most manifest it is, That the Authority of *S. Peter* is urged here to prove the *Godhead of the Holy Ghost*. And then follow the Elogies given to *S. Peter*, the better to set off and make good that Authority; As that he was || *Princeps Apostolorum*, the Prince of the Apostles, and pronounced blessed by Christ; because as God the Father revealed to him the Godhead of the Son, so did he again the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. After this *Epiphanius* calls Him * solidam Petram, a solid Rock, upon which the Church of God was founded, against which the Gates of Hell should not prevail. And adds, That the Faith was rooted, and made firm in him + every way, in him who received

* *Ipsa autem Dominus constituit eum Primum Apostolorum, Petram firmam super quam Ecclesia Dei edificata est; & portie inferiorum non valebunt adversus illum, &c.* Juxta omnem enim modum in *Iso* firmata est fides, qui accepit Clavem Calorum, &c. In hoc enim omnes Querimus as Subtilitates fidei inveniuntur. Epiphan. in Ancorato. Edit. Paris. Lat. 1564. fol. 497. A. Edit. vnde Grati. Latin. Tom. 2. p. 14.

* &c. &c.
S. Mat:16.17.

received the Key of Heaven. And after this, he gives the Reason of all : * Because in Him : (mark I pray, 'tis still in Him, as he was blessed by that Revelation from God the Father, S. Mathew 16.) were found all the ~~simplicitate~~, the very Niceness and exactness of the Christian Faith. For he professed the Godhead of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; And so *omni modo* every Point of Faith was rooted in *Him*. And this is the full meaning of that Learned Father in this passage. Now therefore Building the Church upon Saint Peter in Epiphanius his sense, is not, as if He and his Successors were to be Monarchs over it for ever : But it is the edifying and establishing the Church in the true Faith of Christ by the Confession which S. Peter made. And so † He expresses himself elsewhere most plainly : Saint Peter (saith he) who was made to us indeed a solid Rock firming the Faith of our Lord. On which (Rock) the Church is built *juxta omnem modum, every way*. First, that he Confessed Christ to be the Son of the Living God, and by and by he heard : Upon this Rock of solid Faith I will build my

† *de physico, &c.* Qui factus est nobis
revera sedes Petri firmans. Adam. Denini.
In qua (Peter's) adiuvata est Ecclesia
juxta omnem modum. Prima, quod con-
fessus est Christum esse Filium Dei vir-
ti, & statim audiuit, Super hanc Petram
solide fidei adiuvabat Ecclesiam mean.
— Etiam de Spiritu Sancto idem, &c. E-
piphanius. L. 2. Her. 99. contra Catha-
ros. Tom. 1. p. 500. Edit. Graco-Lat.

Church. And the same Confession he made of the Holy Ghost. Thus was S. Peter a solid Rock upon which the Church was founded *omni modo*, every way. That is, the Faith of the Church was *confirmed by him* in every Point. But that S. Peter was any *Rock*, or *Foundation* of the *Church*, so as that he and his Successors must be relied on in all matters of *Faith*, and govern the *Church* like *Princes*, or *Monarchs*, that Epiphanius never thought of. And that he did never think so, I prove it thus. For beside this apparent meaning of his *Context* (as is here expressed) how could he possibly think of a *Supremacie* due to S. Peter's *Successor*, that in most express terms, and that ** twice repeated*, makes S. James the Brother of our Lord, and not S. Peter, *succeed our Lord in the Principality of the Church.* And Epiphanius was too full both of *Learning* and *Industry*, to speak contrary to himself in a Point of this moment.

* *ille primus*
(speaking of
S. James the
Lords Bro-
ther) *Epis-
copalem Cathe-
dram capiit,*
quam ei ante

et ceteros omnes suum in terris Thronum Domini tradidit. Epiphanius L. 3. Her. 78. Tom. 2. p. 1039. Edit. 1712

similiter, Tom. 1. L. 1. Her. 29.

NUM. 15.
A.C. p. 58.

* *Bellar. L. 1.*
et Rom. Pont.
c. 9. S. Respon-
deo Pontifi-
carum.

† *S. 25. N. 10.*

Next, since A. C. speeds no better with *Irenaeus*, he will have it out of Scripture. And he still tells us, the *Bishop of Rome* is S. Peter's *Successor*. Well. Suppose that. What then ? What ? Why then he succeeded in all S. Peters * *Prerogatives* which are *Ordinary*, and belonged to him as a *Bishop*, though not in the *Extraordinary*, which belonged to him as an *Apostle*. For that's it which you all say, † but no man proves. If this be so, yet then

then I must tell A.C. S. Peter in his Ordinary Power was never made *Pastor of the whole Church*: Nay, in his Extraordinary, he had no * more powerful Principality than the other Apostles * Bellar. ibid. had. A + Primacie of Order was never denied Him by the Protestants: And an U- niversal Supremacie of Power was never granted him by the Primitive Christians. Yea, but Christ promised the Keys to Saint Peter, || S. Mat. 16. True, but so did he to all the rest of the Apostles, * S. Mat. 18. and S. Job. 20. And to their Successors, as much as to His. So tis *Tibi, & Illis*, not *Tibi, non Illis*. I give the Keys to thee and them, not to thee to exclude them. Unless any man will think Heaven-Gates so easie, that they might open and shut them without the Keys. And + S. Augustine is plain: If this were said only to S. Peter, then the Church bath no power to do it; which God forbid! The Keys therefore were given to S. Peter, and the rest, in a Figure of the Church, to whose power, and for whose use They were gived. But there's not one Key in all that Bunch, that can let in S. Peter's Successor, to a more powerful Principality universal than the successors of the other Apostles had.

Yea, but Christ prayed, That S. Peter's Faith might not fail, NUM. 16. * S. Luke 22. That's true. And in that sense, that Christ pray- ed, S. Peter's Faith failed not; That is, in Application to his person for his Perseverance in the Faith, as + S. Prosper applies it. Which Persever- ance yet he must owe and acknowledge to the Grace of Christ's Prayer for him, not to the power and ability of his own Free-Will, as * S. Jerome tells us. + Bellarmine likes not this: Be- cause (faith he) Christ here obtained some special Priviledge for S. Peter, whereas Perseverance in Grace is a Gift common to all the Elect. And he is so far right. And the Special Grace which this Prayer of Christ obtained for S. Peter was, That he should not fall into a final Apostarie; no not when Sathan had stoned him to the bran, that he fell most horribly even into a threefold Denyal of his Master, and that with a Curse. And to recover this, and Persevere, was aliiquid speciale I trow, if any thing ever were. But this will not down with Bellarmine. No, The Aliiquid speciale, the special Thing here obtained was (faith he) That neither S. Peter himself, nor any other that should sit in his seat should teach any thing contrary to the true Faith. That S. Peter after his recovery should preach nothing either as Apostle

+ The Fathers gave three Prerogatives to S. Peter. Of Authority. Of Primacie. And of Principality. But not of Supremacie of Power. Raynold contra Harts cap. 3. Divis. 3. And he proves it at large.

|| S. Mat. 16. 18. * S. Mat. 18. 18. S. Joh. 20. 23.

+ Si hoc Petro tantum dictum est, non facit hoc Ecclesiasticus. S. Aug. Tract. 50. in S. Joh.

+ Dicitur deinde in fine, per se. S. Prosper. L. 1. de Vocatione. Gatt. 24.

* Regavi ut non deficeret, &c. Et certe iusta erat in Apostoli maxima possumus pertinere, ut non deficeret fiducia. &c. S. Hieron. L. 2. adversus Pelagianos.

+ Aliiquid speciale. Bellarm. L. 4. de Rom. Pnt. 1. 3. S. Secundus, quis sine

fratre in Sella fratre in Sella

frater qui docet. Bellar. L. 4. de Rom. Pnt. c. 3.

S. Alterum Privilegium

cit.

or Bishop contrary to the Faith, will easily be granted him; But that none of his successors should do it, but be all *Infallible*, that certainly never came within the Comps of *Rogevi* pro te Petre, I have prayed for thee Peter. And *Bellarmino* Proof of this is his just Confutation. For he proves this *Exposition* of that Text only by the Testimony of seven Popes in their own Cause. And then takes a leap to *Theophylact*, who says nothing to the purpose. So that upon the matter *Bellarmino* confesses there is not one Father of the Church disinterred in the Cause, that understands this Text as *Bellarmino* doth, till you come down to *Theophylact*. So the Popes *Infallibility* appeared to no body but the Popes themselves, for above a thousand years after Christ. For so long it was before *Theophylact* lived. And the spite of it is, *Theophylact* could not see it neither. For the most that *Bellarmino* makes him say is but

* Theophylactus floruit circa An. Dom. 1072.

+ Quia te dabo Primum Bisantiorum, confirmo caetos. Hoc enim dicitur qui post me Ecclesia Petrus es & Fundatum. Bellarm. L. q. de Rer. Pontif. cap. 3. S. Praetorius. Ex Theophyl. in 21. S. Luc.

which Christ prayed for, was personal to S. Peter, and is that which before I mentioned. And *Bellarmino* himself says, That Christ obtained by this Prayer two Privileges, especial ones for Saint Peter. The one, That he should never quite fall from the true Faith, how strongly soever he were tempted. The other, That there should never be found any sitting in his Seat that should teach against it. Now for the first of these,

* Ex quibus privilegiis primus faveat non manavit apostolus, ac secundum inde dicitur mecum ad Petrum tu successores. Bellarm. S. Alenius Privilegium.

* *Bellarmino* doubts it did not flow over to his successors. Why then tis true, which I here say, that this was Personal to S. Peter. But the second he says, Out of all doubt passed over to his successors. Nay, that's not out of all doubt neither. First,

because many Learned men have challenged many Popes for teaching Heresie, and that's against the true Faith. And that which so many Learned Men have affirmed, is not out of all doubt. Or if it be, why does *Bellarmino* take so much pains to confute and disprove them, as t' be doth? Secondly, because Christ obtained of his Father every thing that he prayed for, if he prayed for it absolutely, and not under a Condition. Father, I know thou hearst me always. S. John 11. Now Christ here prayed absolutely for S. Peter; Therefore whatsoever he asked for him was granted. Therefore if Christ intended his successors as well as himself, his Prayer was granted

granted for his Successors as well as for himself. But then, if Bellarmine will tell us absolutely as he doth, * That the whole Gift obtained by this Prayer for S. Peter did belong to his Successors ; and then by and by after break this Gift into two parts, and call the first part into doubt, whether it belongs to his Successors or no, he cannot say the second part is out of all doubt. For if there be reason of doubting the one, there's as much reason of doubting the other, since they stand both on the same foot, *The Validity of Christ's Prayer for Saint Peter.*

Yea, but Christ charged S. Peter to govern, and feed his whole flock, S. John 21. Nay soft. 'Tis but his Sheep and his Lambs ; and that every Apostle, and every Apostles Successor hath charge to do. * S. Matth. 28. But over the whole Flock I find no one Apostle or Successor set. And 'tis a poor shift to say, as A.C. doth, *That the Bishop of Rome is set over the whole Flock, because both over*

Lambs and Sheep. For in every Flock that is not of barren Weathers, there are Lambs and Sheep, that is, f. weaker and stronger Christians ; not People and Pastors, Subjects and Governors, as A.C. expounds it, to bring the Necks of Princes under Roman Pride. And if Kings be meant, yet then the command is Pasce, feed them ; But Deponere, or Occidere, to depose, or kill them, is not Pascere in any sense ; *Lanii id est,* non Pastoria, that's the Butchers, not the Shepherds part. If a Sheep go astray never so far, 'tis not the Shepherds part, to kill him ; at least if he do, *non pascit, dum occidit,* he doth not certainly feed, while he kills.

here A.C. follows Pope Hildebrand close, who in the Case of the Emperor then, asked this Question : *Quando Christiani Ecclesiam suam Petrus constitit, & dividit, Pasce oves meas, exceptas Reges ?* Platin. in vita Greg. 7. And certainly Kings are not exempted from being fed by the Church, but from being spoiled of their Kingdoms by any Church-men, that they are.

And for the Close, *That the Bishop of Rome shall never refuse to feed and govern the whole flock in such sort, as that neither particular Man, nor Church shall have just cause under pretence of Reformation in Manners or Faith to make a Separation from the whole Church.* By A.C.'s favour, this is mere begging of the Question. He says the Pope shall ever govern the whole Whole Church, so as that there shall be no just Cause given of a Separation. And that is the very Thing, which the Protestants charge upon him : Namely, that he hath governed, if not the Whole, yet so much of the Church as he hath been able to bring under his Power, so as that he hath giveu too just Cause of the present continued separation. And as the Corruptions in the Doctrine of Faith, in the Church

of

* Donum hoc loco Petro im-
petratum, etiam ad Successores
pertinet, Bell.
L. 4. de Rom.
Pont. cap. 3.
S. Quarto,
dolum hoc.

* Mat. 28. 21. & S. Mat. 10. 17.
The same power and charge is given
to them all.

A. C. p. 158.

+ And this seems to the
stronger Christians, not People and Pastors, Subjects and Governors, as A.C. expounds it, to bring the Necks of Princes under Roman Pride. And if Kings be meant, yet then the command is Pasce, feed them ; But Deponere, or Occidere, to depose, or kill them, is not Pascere in any sense ; *Lanii id est,* non Pastoria, that's the Butchers, not the Shepherds part. If a Sheep go astray never so far, 'tis not the Shepherds part, to kill him ; at least if he do, *non pascit, dum occidit,* he doth not certainly feed, while he kills.

here A.C. follows Pope Hildebrand close, who in the Case of the Emperor then, asked this Question : *Quando Christiani Ecclesiam suam Petrus constitit, & dividit, Pasce oves meas, exceptas Reges ?* Platin. in vita Greg. 7. And certainly Kings are not exempted from being fed by the Church, but from being spoiled of their Kingdoms by any Church-men, that they are.

And for the Close, *That the Bishop of Rome shall never refuse to feed and govern the whole flock in such sort, as that neither particular Man, nor Church shall have just cause under pretence of Reformation in Manners or Faith to make a Separation from the whole Church.* By A.C.'s favour, this is mere begging of the Question. He says the Pope shall ever govern the whole Whole Church, so as that there shall be no just Cause given of a Separation. And that is the very Thing, which the Protestants charge upon him : Namely, that he hath governed, if not the Whole, yet so much of the Church as he hath been able to bring under his Power, so as that he hath giveu too just Cause of the present continued separation. And as the Corruptions in the Doctrine of Faith, in the Church

NUM. 18.
A.C.p.58.

of Rome were the Cause of the first Separation ; so are they at this present day the Cause why the separation continues. And farther, I for my part, am clear of Opinion, that the Errors in the Doctrine of Faith, which are charged upon the whole Church, at least so much of the whole, as in these parts of Europe hath been kept under the Roman Jurisdiction, have had their Original and Continuance from this, that so much of the Universal Church (which indeed they account All) hath forgotten her own Liberty, and submitted to the Roman Church and Bishop ; and so is in a manner forced to embrace all the Corruptions, which the Particular Church of Rome hath contracted upon it self. And being now not able to free her self from the Roman Jurisdiction, is made to continue also in all her Corruptions. And for the Protestants, they have made no separation from the General Church properly so called (for therein A. C. said well, v. the Popes Administration can give no Cause to separate from that) but their Separation is only from the Church of Rome, and such other Churches, as by adhering to her, have hazarded themselves, and do now mislead themselves, the Whole Catholike Church. Nay, even here the Protestants have not left the Church of Rome in her Essence, but in her Errors ; not in the Things which Constitute a Church, but only in such Abuses and Corruptions, as work toward the Dissolution of a Church.

F. I also asked, who ought to judge in this Case ? The B. said, a General Council.

§. 26. NUM. I. B. And surely, What greater or surer Judgment you can have, where sense of Scripture is doubted, than a General Council, I do not see : Nor do you doubt. And A. C. grants it to be a most Competent Judge of all Controversies of Faith, so that all Pastors be gathered together, and in the Name of Christ, and pray unanimously for the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost, and make great and diligent search and examination of the Scriptures, and other Grounds of Faith ; And then Decree what is to be held for Divine Truth. For then (faith he) 'tis Firm, and Infallible, or else there is nothing firm upon earth. As fair as this Passage seems, and as freely as I have granted, that a General Council is the best Judge on Earth, where the sense of Scripture is doubted ; yet even in this passage there are some things Considerable. As first, when shall the Church hope for such a General Council, in which all Pastors shall be gathered together ? there was never any such General Council yet, nor do I believe such can be had. So that's supposed in vain ; and you might have learn'd this of

* Bel-

* Bellarmine : if you will not believe me. Next (faith he) If all these Pastors pray unanimously for the promised Assistance of the Holy Ghost. Why , but if all Pastors cannot meet together, all cannot pray together, nor all search the Scriptures together, nor all upon that Search Decree together. So that is supposed in vain too. Yea, but Thirdly, If all that meet do pray unanimously. What then ? All that meet are not simply All. Nor doth the Holy Ghost come, and give his Assistance upon every Prayer, that is made unanimously, though by very many Prelates or other Faithful People met together, unless all other Requisites as well as Unanimity, to make their prayer to be heard and granted, be observed by them ; So that an *Unanimous Prayer* is not adequately supposed, and therefore Concludes not. But lastly, how far a General Council, if all A. C's Conditions be observed, is firm, and Infallible, that shall be more fully discussed at after. + In + §. 33. confit. the mean time, these two words Firm and Infallible are ill put together as *Synonima's*. For there are some things most Infallible in themselves , which yet could never get to be made firm among men. And there are many things made firm by Law, both in Churches and Kingdoms, which yet are not Infallible in themselves. So to draw all together ; to settle Controversies in the Church, here is a *Visible Judge* and Infallible, but not living. And that is the || Scripture pronoun-

* Si omnes, nullum fuit bacillus concilium Generale, neque etiam videtur deinceps futurum. Bellarm. 1. de Conc. cap. 17. §. 1.

stians were as humble as Learned. I am sure Optatus thought so. Querendi sunt Judices. Si christiani de utraque parte dari non possunt, quia fiducia veritas impeditur, De foris querendis est Judex. Si Paganus, non potest nosse Christiana Secreta. Si Iudeus, inimicus est Christiani Baptismatis. Ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit repertus Judicium. Dicitur Calo querendus est Judex. Sed ut quid pulsamus ad Colum quum habemus hic in Evangelio ? Testamentum (inquit quia hoc tunc recte possunt terrena celestibus comparari) scilicet quod quisvis hominum babens numerosos filios, his quamdiu pater praesens est, ipse imperat singulis ; non est adhuc necessarium Testamentum. Sic & Christus, quamdiu praesens in terris fuit, (quamvis nec modo defit) pro tempore quicquid necessarium erat, Apostolice Imperavit. Sed quomodo terrenus Pater dum se in confusione senserit mortis, timens ne post mortem suam, rupta pace litigent fratres, adhibitis Testimonib[us] Voluntatibus, scilicet de Peccato mortis transfert in Tabulas diu duraturas. Et si fuerit inter fratres contentio nata, nos iterum ad Testamentum, sed queritur. Testamentum ; & qui Tumula quisicit, tacitus in Tabula loquitur. Virius, cuius est Testamentum, in Caelo est. Ergo voluntas eius, velut in Testamento, sicut in Evangelio inquiratur. Opt. l. 5. adv. Parte.

This pregnant Place of Optatus, (That the Scripture is the Judge of Disputes Truth, whenever it is questioned) though Baldwin dare not deny both, yet he would fain slide by it, and by a parallel place as full in S. Aug. in Psal. 21. Expositione 2. with this shift, that S. Augustine in another place had rather use the Testimony of Tradition, that is, the Testimony *Nancipatio* potius quam Scripti Testamenti, of the *Nancipative*, rather than the written Will of Christ. Baldwin. in Optat. l. 5. But this is a mere shift. First, because it is *Petitio principii*, the mere begging of the Question. For we deny any Testament of Christ , but that which is written. And A. C. cannot shew it in any one Father of the Church, that Christ ever left behind him a *Nancipative obligatory will*. Secondly, because nothing is more plain in these two Fathers, Optatus and S. Augustine, than that both of them appeal to the written Will, and make that the Judge without any Exception, when a matter of Faith comes in Question. In Optat. the words are : *Habemus in Evangelio*, we have it in the Gospel. And *in Evangelio inquiratur*, Let it be inquired in the Gospel : And Christ put it in *tabulas diu duraturas*, into Written and lasting Instruments. In S. Augustine the words are : *Our Father did not dye intestate*, &c. And *Tabula apertantur*, Let his Will, his written Instruments be opened. And *Legamus Verba mortui*, Let the words of him that dyed, be read. And again, *Aperi, Legamus*, Open the Will, and let us read. And *Legamus, quid litigamus*? Why do we strive? Let's read the Will. And again, *Aperi Testamentum, lege, Open the Will, read*. All which Passages are most express and full for his written Will, and not for any *Nancipative Will*, as Baldwin would put upon us. And Hart who takes the same way with Baldwin, is not able to make it out, as appears by Dr. Reynolds in his Conference with Hart, c. 8. divisi. i. p. 396, &c.

|| And this was thought sufficient Judge too,

when Christ

cinc by the Church. And there is a *visible* and a *Living Judge*, but not *Infallible*; and that is a *General Council*, lawfully called, and so proceeding. But I know no formal *Confirmation* of it needful (though *A.C.* require it, *) but only

* §. 28. Num. 1. And so plainly S. *Augustine* speaking of S. *Cyprian*'s Error about Rebaptization, &c. says, *Illi temporibus antequam Plenarii Concilii sententia quid in hac sequendum esset, totius Ecclesie Confessio confirmasset, Vixum est ei cum, &c. L. 1. de Bapt. cont. Donatist. c. 18.* So, here is first *Sententia Concilii*: And then the Confirmation of it is *totius Ecclesie Confessio*, the Consent of the whole Church yielding unto it. And so *Gerson*. *Concurrente Universali totius Ecclesie confessio, &c. In Declaratione Veritatum que credende sunt, &c. §. 4.* For this, that the Pope must confirm it, or else the General Council is invalid, is one of the *Roman Novelties*. For this cannot be shewed in any Antiquity void of just Exception. The truth is, the Pope as other Patriarchs and great Bishops used to do, did give his assent to such Councils as he approved. But that is no Corroboration of the Council, as if it were invalid without it: but a Declaration of his consenting with the rest. §. 33. *Confid. 4. Num. 6.*

NUM. 2.
A.E. p. 59, 60.

In the next Place, *A.C.* interposes new matter quite out of the *Conference*. And first in case of *Distractions* and *Disunion* in the Church, he would know, what is to be done to Re-unite, when a *General Council* (which is acknowledged a fit Judge) cannot be had by reason of manifold impediments: Or if being called, will not be of one mind? Hath Christ our Lord (saith he) in this Case provided no Rule, no Judge *Infallibly* to determine Controversies, and to procure Unity and Certainty of Belief? Indeed the Protestants admit no *Infallible Means, Rule, or Judge*, but only *Scripture*, which every man may interpret, as he pleaseth, and so all shall be uncertain. Truly, I must confess, there are many Impediments to hinder the Calling of a *General Council*. You know in the Ancient Church there was + hindrance enough, and what hurt it wrought. And afterward though it were long first, there was provision made for || frequent calling of *Councils*, and yet no Age since saw them called according to that Provision in every Circumstance; therefore Impediments there were enough, or else some declined them wilfully, though there were no Impediments. Nor will I deny, but that when they were called, there were as many * *Practices* to distract or pervert the *Councils*. And these *Practices* were able to keep many *Councils* from being all of one mind. But if being called, they will not be of one mind, I cannot help that; Though that very *not agreeing* is a shrewd sign, that the other Spirit hath a party there against the *Holy Ghost*.

^{+ Christianitas in diuersas Heresies scripsit, quia non erat licet Episcopis in unum convenire, persecutio se volebat usque ad tempora Constantini, &c. Hinc dor. prefat. in Concl. Edit. Venet. 1585.}
 || *Frequens Generalium Conciliorum celebratio est principia cultus Agri Domini, &c. Et illo loco negligimus*
Erros, Haros, & Schismata diffinimur. Hec præteriorum temporum recordatio & presentium consideratio ante oculos nostros ponunt. Itaque sancimus, ut à modo Concilia Generalia celebrentur; ita quod Primum à fine hujus Concilii in quinquennium immediate sequens, Secundum vix à fine illius in septennium, & deinceps de decennio in decennium perpetuè celebrantur, &c. Concil. Constant. Sess. 39. Et apud Geroni, Tom. 1. p. 230. Et Pet. de Aliaco Card. Cameracensis libellum obtulit in Concil. Constant. de Reformatione Ecclesie contra Oiniacionem eorum qui putarunt Concilia Generalia minus necessaria esse, quia Omnia bene à Patribus nostris ordinatae sunt, &c. In falso. Rerum expetendarum. fol. 28. Et Schismatibus debet Ecclesia citè per Concilia Generalia provideri, ut in Primitivis Ecclesia docerunt Apostoli, ut Act. 6. & Act. 15. Ibid. fol. 204. A.
In Concil. Ariminensi multis panorum fraude deceptis, &c. S. Aug. L. 3. contra Maximum, c. 18.

Now

Now A. C. would know, what is to be done for Re-uniting NUM. 3 of a Church divided in *Doctrine of the Faith*; when this Remedy by a General Council cannot be had; *Sure Christ our Lord* (saith he) *hath provided some Rule, some Judge in such and such like Cases to procure unity and certainty of Belief.* I believe so too; for he hath left an *Infallible Rule*, the *Scripture*. And that by the manifest Places in it (which need no Dispute, no External Judge) is * able to settle *Unity* and *Certainty of Belief in Necessaries to Salvation*; And in *Non necessariis*, in ^{* Non per difficiles nos} *Deus ad Bea-*
and about things not necessary, there ought not to be a *Contention to a + Separation.*

^{+ Non per difficiles nos} *Iesum suscitatum a mortuis per Deum Credere, & Iesum esse Dominum confiteri, &c. S. Hilari. L. 10. de Trin. ad finem.*

+ Cyprianus & College ipsius credentes Hereticos & Schismatics Baptizant non habere, *Hoc Baptismo re-*
cepit, &c. iis tamen communicare quam separari ab Unitate maluerunt. S. Aug. L. 2. de Bapt. contra Donatist.

6. Et hi non contaminabat Cyprianum. Ibid. fine.

And therefore A. C. does not well, to make that a Crime; NUM. 4: that the Protestants admit no *Infallible Rule*, but the *Scripture only*: Or as he (I doubt not without some scorn) terms it, beside *only Scripture*. For what need is there of another, since this is most *Infallible*; and the same which the * *Ancient Church of Christ* admitted? And if it were sufficient for the *Antient Church* to guide them, and direct their *Councils*, why should it be now held insufficient for us, at least, till a free General Council may be had? And it hath both the Conditions which + Bellarmine requires to a *Rule*: Namely, that it be ^{* Recensuit cuncta sanctissim Scripturam con-}
^{cipialis de qua Parasetus ag-}
^{certain}, and that it be *Known*; For if it be not certain, it is ^{5. Hisp. c. 20.} ^{nitus. Tert. de}
^{no Rule}; and if it be not known, 'tis *no Rule to us*. Now the ^{Monogam. c. 2.} And this is
|| Romanists dare not deny, but this *Rule* is *Certain*; and that true, though it is sufficiently *Known* in the *manifest Places* of it, and such the Author spake it, when as are *necessary to Salvation*, none of the *Antients* did ever he was Lap-
deny; so there's an *Infallible Rule*.

turas apprendit tenet. S. Hieron. ad Marcellum adversus Montanum. Tom. 2. *Hoc quia de Scripturis non habet autoritatem, cùdem facilitate non contennitur, quā probatur.* S. Hieron. in S. Matth. 23.

Manifestus est fidei lapsus, & liquidum superbie virtutum vel resurrexit aliquid eorum que Scriptura habet, vel inducere quicquam quod scriptum non est. S. Basil. Serm. de Fid. Tom. 2. p. 154. Edit. Basileæ, 1555.

Contra insurgeantes Hereses sive pugnatis Agraphis, verum non aliud à pia fonsdum Scripturam sententiā. I. bid. p. 153.

And before Basil, Tertul. *Adoro Scriptura plexitudinem, &c. si non est scriptum, timet Hermogenes.* *Ye illud adjacentibus vel detrahebatibus destitutum.* Tertul. advers. Hermog. c. 22.

And Paulinus plainly calls it *Regula Directio*, Epist. 23.

De hac Regula tria observanda sunt. 1. Regula est, sed à tempore quo scripsit. 2. Regula est, sed per Ecclesiasticam applicanda, nos per prizatum Spiritum. 3. Regula est, & meatur omnia quae continent: continent autem, omnia necessaria ad salutem vel mediate vel immediata. Et hoc tertium habet. Biel. in 3. D. 25. q. unicā. Concluſ. 4. M. And this is all we say. Hook. L. 5. Eccles. Pol. §. 22.

+ Regula Catholicæ fidei debet esse certa & nota. Si certa non sit, non erit Regula. Si nota non sit, non erit Regula nobis. Bellar. L. 1. de Verbo Dei, c. 2. §. 5. Sed nihil est vel certius vel notius Sacra Scriptura. Bellarm. ibid. §. 6. Therefore the Holy Scripture is the Rule of Catholicæ Faith, both in it self, and to us also; For in things simply necessary to Salvation, it is abundantly known and manifest, as §. 16. Nu. 5.

|| Convenit inter nos & omnes omnino Hereticos, Verbum Dei est Regula fidei, ex quā de Dogmatibus jadicandum sit. Bellarm. Prefat. Tom. 1. fin. And although there perhaps he includes Traditions, yet that was never proved yet. Neither indeed can he include Traditions. For he speaks of that Word of God, upon which all Heretics consent: But concerning Traditions, they all consent not, That they are a Rule of Faith. Therefore he speaks not of them.

NUM. 5.

Nor need there be such fear of a *Private Spirit* in these *manifest things*, which being but read, or heard, teach themselves. Indeed you *Romanists* had need of some other *Judge*, and he a propitious one, to crush the *Pope's more powerful Principality*, out of *Pasce oves*, feed my sheep. And yet this must be the meaning (if you will have it) whether *Gideon's* fleece be wet, or dry, *Judg. 6.* that is, whether there be dew enough in the *Text*, to water that *sense* or no. But I pray, when God hath left his Church this *Infallible Rule*, what warrant have you to seek another? You have shewed us none yet, what e're you think you have. And I hope *A. C.* cannot think, it follows, that Christ our Lord hath provided no *Rule to determine necessary Controversies*, because he hath not provided the *Rule*, which he would have.

NUM. 6.

* For so he affirms, p. 58.

1 Cor. 11.15.

Besides, let there be such a living *Judge*, as *A. C.* would have, and let the * *Pope* be he; yet that is not sufficient against the malice of the *Devil*, and *impious men*, to keep the Church at all Times from *Renting*, even in the *Doctrine of Faith*; or to foder the *Rents* which are made. For *Oportet esse Hereses*, *I Cor. 11.* *Heresies* there will be, and *Heresies* properly there cannot be, but in *Doctrine of the Faith*. And what will *A. C.* in this Case do? Will he send *Christ* our *Lord* to provide another *Rule* than the *Decision of the Bishop of Rome*, because he can neither make *Unity*, nor *Certainty of Belief*? And (as 'tis most apparent) he cannot do it *de facto*; so neither hath he power from *Christ* over the Whole Church to do it: nay out of all doubt, 'tis not the least reason, why *de facto* he hath so little success, because *de Jure* he hath no power given. But since *A. C.* requires another *Judge* besides the *Scripture*, and in Cases, when either the time is so difficult, that a *General Council* cannot be called; or the *Council* so set, that they will not agree; Let's see, how he proves it.

NUM. 7.
A. C. p. 60.

Tis thus; *every earthly Kingdom* (saith he) *when matters cannot be composed by a Parliament* (which cannot be called upon all Occasions; why doth he not add here, And which being called, will not always be of one mind, as he did add it in Case of the Council?) *bath, besides the Law-Books, some living Magistrates and Judges, and above all, one visible King, the Highest Judge, who bath Authority sufficient to end all Controversies, and settle Unity in all Temporal Affairs*. And shall we think that *Christ* the wisest King bath provided in his Kingdom, the Church, only the *Law-Books* of the *Holy-Scripture*, and no living visible *Judges*, and above all, one *Chief*, so assisted by his *Spirit* as, may suffice to end all Controversies for *Unity* and *Certainty of Faith*; which can never be, if every man may interpret *Holy Scripture*, the *Law-Books*, as he list? This is a very plausible Argument with the Many. But the

the foundation of it is but a * *Similitude*; and if the *Similitude* hold not in the main, the Argument's nothing. And so I doubt, it will prove here. I'll observe Particulars, as they lie *scattered*, in order.

sed rebus ipsis satisfiat, &c. S. August. *L. de Quant. Anime*, cap. 32. Whereupon the *Logicians* tell us rightly, that this is a Fallacie, unless it be taken *redundantivè*, i. e. *de similitibus qua similita sunt*: And hence Aristotle himself *2. Top. loc. 32.* says, *mās tūl tūl opūl, si qūl sūl lūl. Rūlūl in Similitus, & similitūl se habent.*

And first, he will have the whole *Militant Church* (for of N. U. M. 8. that we speak) a *Kingdom*. But this is not certain: For they are no mean ones, which think our *Saviour Christ* left the *Church Militant* in the Hands of the *Apostles*, and their *Successors*, in an *Aristocratical*, or rather a *Mixt Government*; and that the *Church* is not * *Monarchical* otherwise than the *Triumphant* and *Militant* make one Body under *Christ the Head*. And in this sense indeed, and in this only, the *Church* is a most absolute *Kingdom*. And the very Expressing of this sense is a full Answer to all the Places of Scripture, and other Arguments brought by † *Bellar.* to prove that the *Church* is a *Monarchy*. But the *Church* being as large as the world, *Christ* thought it fitter to govern it *Aristocratically*, by *Divers*, rather than by *One Vice-Roy*. And I believe this is true. For all the time of the first three hundred years, and somewhat better, it was governed *Aristocratically*, if we will impartially consider, how the *Bishops* of those times carried the whole Business of admitting any new consecrated *Bishops* or others to, or rejecting them from their *Communion*. For I have carefully Examined this for the first six hundred years, even to, and within the time of S. *Gregory the great*. || Who in the beginning of the seventh hundred year sent such Letters to *Augustine* then *Archbishop of Canterbury*, and to * *Quirinus*, and other *Bishops in Ireland*; And I finde, That the *Literæ Communicatorie* which certified from one Great *Patriarch* to another, who were fit or unfit to be admitted to their *Communion*, if they upon any Occasion repaired to their *Seas*, were sent mutually. And as freely, and in the same manner from *Rome* to the other *Patriarchs*, as from them to it. Out of which, I think, this will follow most directly, *That the Church*

* When *Gerson* writ his *Tract. De Ante-*
ribilitate Papæ, sure he thought the
Church might continue in a very good
Being, without a *Monarchical Head*.
Therefore, in his Judgment, the *Church*
is not by any Command, or Institution
of *Christ*, *Monarchical*. *Gerson. par. 1.*
pap. 154.

When S. *Hierome* wrote thus: [*ubi-*
cunque fuerit Episcopus, five Romæ, five
Eugubii, five Constantinopoli, five Rhe-
giæ, five Alexandriæ, five Tanis; ejus-
dem miriti, ejusdem est Sacerdotum. :
S. *Hieron. Epist. ad Evaristum.*] doubtless he thought not of the *Roman Bish-*
ops Monarchy. For what *Bishop* is of
the same Merit, or of the same Degree,
in the *Priesthood* with the *Pope*, as
things are now carried at *Rome*? *Affir-*
mamus etiam, Patribus & Gracis & La-
tini, signat as eff vocis di Petro ant Papa
Monarchia & Monarchia. Nam quod in
superioribus observabamus reveri eas di-
ciones posse pro Episcopo, & Episco-
pato, nihil hoc in romane. Ita Calabro.
Exercitation 15. ad Annales Ecclesi. Ba-
ron. S. 12. p. 370. & S. 11. p. 360. diser-
it affectus & probat Ecclesie Regimur Ari-
stocraticum ius.

† *Bellar. L. 2. de Concil. c. 16. S. 1. 2. 3.*

|| S. *Greg. L. 9. Epist. 43. & L. 12. Ep-*

pist. 15.

* S. *Greg. L. 9. Epist. 61.*

Church-Government then was Aristocratical. For had the *Bishop of Rome* been then accounted Sole Monarch of the Church, and been put into the *Definition of the Church* (as he is now by * *Bellarmino*) all these *Communicatory Letters* should have been directed from *him* to the *rest*, as whose admittance ought to be a Rule for all to Communicate; but not from *others* to *him*, or at least not in that *even, equal, and Brotherly way*, as now they appear to be written. For it is no way probable, that the *Bishops of Rome*, which even then sought their own Greatness too much, would have submitted to the other *Patriarchs* voluntarily, had not the very Course of the *Church* put it upon them.

Besides, this is a great and undoubted Rule, given by * Op-
tatus. That wheresoever there is a Church, there the Church is
in the Common-wealth, not the Common-wealth in the Church.
And so also the Church was in the Roman Empire. Now from this
Ground I argue thus : If the Church be within the Empire or
other Kingdom, 'tis impossible the Government of the Church
should be Monarchical. For no Emperor or King will endure
another King within his Dominion that shall be greater than
himself, since the very induring it, makes him that inctres it,
upon the matter, no Monarch. Nor will it disturb this Argu-
ment : That two Great Kings in France and Spain permit this,
For he that is not blind, may see, if he will, of what little va-
lue the Pope's power is in those Kingdoms, farther than to serve
their own turns of Him, which They do to their great ad-
vantage. Nay farther, the Ancient Canons and Fathers of
the Church seem to me plain for this : For the ^a Council of
Antioch submits Ecclesiastical Causes to the Bishops. And what
was done amiss by a Bishop, was corrigible by a ^b Synod of Bi-
shops, but this with the ^c Metropolitare. And in Case these
did not agree, the ^d Metropolitane might call in other Bishops
out of the neighbouring Provinces. And if Things settled not
this way, a General Council (^e under the Scripture, and direc-
ted by it) was the Highest Remedy. And ^f S. Cyprian even
to Pope Cornelius himself says plainly : That to every Bishop is
ascribed a portion of the flock for him to govern. And so not
all committed to One. In all this the Government of the
Church seems plainly Aristocratical. And if all other Argu-
ments fail, we have one left from Bellarmine, who opposes it
as much as any, & twice for failing. And yet, where he goes
to Exclude Secular Princes from Church-Government, ^g all his
Quotations, and all his Proofs run upon this Head, to shew,
That the Government of the Church was ever in the Bishops.
What says ^h A. C. now to the Confession of this great Adver-
sary, and in this great Point, extorted from him by force of
Truth? Now if this be true, then the whole foundation of

this Argument is gone. *The Church Militant is no Kingdom;* and therefore not to be Compared, or Judged by One. The Resemblance will not hold.

Next, suppose it a Kingdom : yet the *Church Militant remaining one, is spread in many Earthly Kingdoms ;* and cannot well be ordered like any one particular * Kingdom. And therefore, though in one particular Kingdom there be many Visible Judges, and one Supreme : yet it follows not, That in the *Universal Militant Church* there must be one Supreme. For how will he enter to Execute his Office, if the Kings of those Kingdoms will not give leave ?

Tum quid omnia Negotia unius populi partialis potest sustinere unus solus : Nullus autem unus potest sustinere omnia Negotia etiam majora omnium Christianorum. Tum quid minus malum est, ut populus partialis & parvus inficiatur ab uno Episcopo, quam ut totus, vel sicut totus populus Christianus inficiatur ab uno Capite, quod omnibus prestat. Ockam, L. 2. Dial. Tract. 1. p. 3. c. 30. ad 8. And besides this of Ockam : To that Common Argument, that Monarchical Government is the best, and therefore undoubtedly that which Christ instituted for his Church, is sufficient to Answer, That a Monarchy is the best form of Government in one City or Country. *Ari. L. 8. Moral. c. 10.* But it follows not, That it is the best in respect of the whole world, where the Parts are so remote, and the dispositions of men so various. And therefore Bellarm. himself confesses, *Monarchiam Aristocratię & Democraticę administrari utiliorē esse in hac vita, quam simplex Monarchia ē.* L. 1. de Rom. Pont. c. 3. §. 1.

Now here, though A. C. expresses himself no farther, yet I NUM. 16. we know, what he and his Fellows would be at. They would not be troubled to ask leave of any several Kings in their several Dominions. No : they would have one Emperor over all the Kings, as well as One Pope over all the Bishops. And then you know * who told us of two great Lights to govern the World, the Sun and the Moon, that is, the Pope and the Emperor. At the first it began with more modesty, The Emperor and the Pope. And that was somewhat Tolerable. For + S. Augustine tells us, That the Militant Church is often in Scripture called the Moon, both for the many Changes it hath, and for its obscurity in many times of its peregrination. And he tells us too, That if we will understand this place of Scripture in a Spiritual Sense : || Our Saviour Christ is the Sun, and the Militant Church, as being full of changes in her estate, the Moon. But now it must be a Triumphant Church here ; Militant no longer. The Pope must be the Sun, and the Emperor but the Moon. And lest Innocent. own power should not be able to make good his Decretal ; * Gasper Schioppini doth not only avow the Allusion or Interpretation, but is pleased to express many Circumstances, in which he would fain make the world believe the Resemblance holds. And left

* *Licit ut Ex-
pediens quod
uni Populo
partiali fidei
prestat unus E-
piscopus ; non
expedit tamen
quod toti po-
pulo fidei pre-
stat unus solus.*

+ In the first Gloss scriber to Isidor, in Gen. 1.16. "is Per Solen intelligitur Re-
gnum ; per Lunam, Sacrdotium. But In-
nocent the Third, almost six hundred
years after Isidore's death, perverts both
Text and Gloss. Thus : *Ad firmamen-
tum coll. i. e. Universale Ecclesie, scilicet
Papa duo magna Luminaria, hoc est, duas
instituit Pontificatus, Pontificalem, & Re-
galem, &c. ut quanta inter solum &
lunam lumen Pontificatus & Reges dis-
cretiva cognoscatur. Epist. ad Imperial.
Constantinopolitanum. Dicer. l. 2. de
Majoritate & Obditio. It. 33, cap.
Sexto.*

+ *Ecclesia Militans sicut in Scripturis de-
citur Luna, propter Mundilitatem, &c.
S. Aug. 191. 119. c. 6.*

|| *Intelligimus spiritualiter Ecclesiam, &c.
Et sic quis est Sol, nisi Sol Justitiae ? &c.
S. Aug. in Psal. 103.*

* *Gasp. Schi-
oppi op. L. dicto
Ecclesiasticis
caus. 6. 143. in*

lest any man should not know how much the Pope is made greater than the Emperor by this Comparison ;

* *Igitur cum terra sit septies major Luna, Sol autem octies major terra, restat ergo ut Papalis dignitas quadrigesset spesies sex major Regalis dignitate. Gloss. in Secret. predicti. Where first the Gloss is out in his Latin. He might have said Quadragesimæ : for Quadragesimæ is no word. Next, he is out in his Arithmetick. For eight times seven makes not forty seven, but fifty six. And then he is much to blame for drawing down the Pope's power from fifty six to forty seven. And lastly, this Allusion bath no ground of Truth at all. For the Emperor, being Solo Deo minor, Tertul. ad Scap. cannot be a Moon to any other Sun.*

* *Sed illa Potestas, qua præstet diuinis, i. e. in Spiritualibus, maior est; qua vero carnaliis, minor. Innocent. 3. ad supra.*

¶ Ut post ejus mortem, nihil eorum que in hac vita egit, laudaverit, aut improbarerit, immutatum sit. Platina in vita ejus.

* *Gloss furnishes us with that too : and tells us, that by this it appears, that since the Earth is seven times greater than the Moon, and the Sun eight times greater than the Earth ; it must needs follow, that the Pope's power is forty seven times greater than the Emperor's. I like him well, he will make odds enough. But what, doth Innocent the Third give no Reason of this his Decretal ? Yes. And it is (saith he) + because the Sun, which rules in the day, that is, in spiritual things, is greater than the Moon, which rules but in the night, and in carnal things. But is it possible that Innocentius the Third, being so wise, and so able, as || that nothing which he did, or commended, or disproved in all his life, should after his death be thought fit to be changed, could think that such an Allusion*

*to the Day, which the Sun governs, and Worldly Business to the Night, which the Moon governs, should carry weight enough with it to depress Imperial power lower than God hath made it ? Out of doubt he could not. For he well knew that *Omnis Anima*, every Soul was to be subject to the Higher Power, Rom. 13. And the * Higher Power there mentioned, is the Temporal. And the + Ancient Fathers come in with a full consent, That *Omnis Anima*, every Soul, comprehends there all without any Exception : All Spiritual men, even to the Highest Bishop ; and in Spiritual Causes too, so the Foundations of Faith and Good Manners be not shaken. And where they are shaken, there ought to be Prayer and Patience, there ought not to be Opposition by force. Nay he knew well that*

Rom. 13. 1.

* *Patres veteris, & prædicti August. Epist. 54. apote- stolam inter- pretantur de Potestate secu- larium tantum lo- qui, quod & ipse textus sub- indicat, &c. Salmeron, Disput. 4. in Rom. 13. S. Porro per Pat-*

|| Emperors and Kings are Custodes utrinque Tabule : They, to statim.

+ *Nisi recta habeatis, ut impetratis, &c. Omnibus ipsis imperantur, & Sacroribus & Monachis, &c. Et postea. Etiamq[ue] Apostolus hi, si Evangelista, si Prophetæ, sive quicunque tandem fueris. S. Chrysost. Hom. 23. in Rom. Sive ab Sacerdotibus, sive Autistis, &c. Theodoret. in Rom. 13. Si omnis Anima, & utra. Quis vos exigit ab imperantibus ? &c. Ipsa sum quod vobis dicere solent, servare vestrum sedis honorum, &c. S. Cyprianus aliter & Iustini & Gessu, &c. S. Bern. Epist. 42. ad Henricum Senonensem Archibispacum. Et Theophylact. in Rom. 13. Where it is very observable, that Theophylact lived in the time of Pope Gregory the Second ; And S. Bernard after it, and yet this Truth obtained then. And this was about the year 1130.*

|| *Au fidei de Religione fas non est ut dicas Imperator, vel quis maioris Imperator? Cur ergo ad Imperatorem seculi- venter Legati ? Cur enim fecerunt Cause sue Judicem, nos facilius quod ille judicari ? &c. S. Aug. L. 1. cont. Epist. Parthen. 6. 9. Et Quæfis fuit, an pertinet ad Imperatorum adiutoris, eos aliquid Imperator qui presuma in Religione possit. Tunc. Nor can this be laid to be usurpation in the Emperor. Nam S. August. alibi sic. Ad Imperatoris curiam, quæ ratiocinio Deo redditum est, illa maxime pertinet. S. Aug. Epist. 102. & Epist. 50. Quis mente subire Regibus dicat : Nolite curare in Regno vestro à quo creatus, vel appagatum Ecclesia Domini vestri ? &c. Antiquitus recte dixit, Magistratus est cuius Legis, scilicet Prima & Secunda Tabula, quod ad disciplinam animis confuso Saxonis, 9. 23. & Gerards, Tom. 6. locorum, c. 6. S. 5. Membrio 1. prebat ex Deut. 17. 18.*

whom

whom the custody and preservation of both Tables of the Law for worship to God, and duty to man, are committed. That a Book of the Law was by Gods own Command in Moses his time, to be given the King, * Deut. 17: That the Kings under that Law, but still according to it, did proceed to Necessary Reformations in Church-Businesses ; and therin Commanded the very Priests themselves, as appears in the Acts of † Hezekiah and ‡ Josiah, who yet were never Censured to this day for usurping the High-Priests Office. Nay, he knew full well, That the greatest Emperors for the Churches Honour, Theodosius the Elder, and Justinian, and Charles the Great, and divers other, did not only meddle now and then, but did enact Laws to the great Settlement and Increase of Religion in their several times. But then if this could not be the Reason, why Innocentius made this strange Assertion, what was ? Why truly, I'll tell you. The Pope was now grown to a great, and a firm height.

* Gregory the Seventh had set the Popedom upon a broad bottom before this Innocents time. So that now 'tis the less wonder, if he make so bold with the Emperor, as to depress him as low as the Moon, upon no better ground, than a groundless Resemblance. But beside this prime Reason, there are divers other, which may easily be drawn out of the same Resemblance. For since Innocentius his main aim was to publish the Popes greatness over Kings and Emperors : Why doth he not tell us, That the Pope is as the Sun, and the Emperor as the Moon ? Because as the Moon borrows all her light from the Sun : So the Emperor borrows all his true light from the Pope. Or because as the Moon still increases in light so long as she follows the Sun, but so soon as ever she steps before the Sun she waines presently, and her light decreases : So the Emperor, so long as he is content to follow the Pope, and do all that he would have him, his light, and his power, increase ; but if he do but offer to step before (though that be his proper place) then his light, and honour, and power, and all decrease. And this Pope Gregory the Seventh made too good upon the Emperour Henry the Third. And Pope Adrian the Fourth, and Alexander the Fourth, and Lucius the Third, with some others, upon Frederick Barbarossa. And some other Emperours were alike serv'd, where they did not submit. And I hope no man will blame the Popes Holiness for this. For, if the Emperours kept the Popes under for divers years together,

* Hic Maximus Pantifen totius Ecclesiastice Libertatis unicus Auctor. Onuphi. in Plat. in Greg. 7. For taking Occasion by the War which Henry the Fourth had with the Saxons and their neighbours, and the complaint of the Saxons made to the Pope (of which Platina in the life of Gregory the Seventh) the Pope wife enough for his own advantages, fought not only to free himself from the Emperor, but to make the Emperor subject to him ; and for this the History is plain enough.

* Papa utpote Regis Regum Vicarius numeram erat de jure subditus Imperatoribus terrenis . sed quia tum Potestas eius non erat nota : & quia viribus temporibus definitus erat , vellet , volebat , substitutus esse cogebatur . Bellar. in *Apologia* , c. 15 . Respon. ad *Mendacium* . 10 . And Bellarmine is at the same Argument for *Draping of Kings* too : *Quia deinceps virtes temporales Christiani* . Bellar. L 5 , de Rom. Pont. c. 7 . S. *Quod si Christiani* . Now this is a most lowd untruth , as appears in *Tertullian* , who lived about the year 200 under *Sextus* . And the Christians then had strength enough against the Emperor , had they had right enough with it .
† *L. de Monar.*

and as *Innocentius* did in the *Decretal* very grossly) you may say 'tis , because the *Woman* , which all grant represented the

|| *Revel. 12.1. Church* , || *Revel. 12.*

the glorious rays

* *Sic enim Alexander Tertius collum Frederici Primi pate comprimitat , & dixit , Scriptum est , Super aspidem & basilicum , &c. Jo. Nauckius , chron. Generatione 40. circa An. 1370.*

Gen. 1.16.

two suns in one orb

in one orb

at yachim

</div

doubt but he will, considering what some great Kings make of the Pope's Power at this day, when it pleases them.

And since we are in this Comparison between the Sun and the Moon, give me leave a little farther to examine, who A.C. and his fellow-Jesuites with some others would have to be this one Emperor. I am not willing to meddle with any the secret Designes of Foreign States: but if they will express their Designes in print, or publish them by Great and Full Authority, I hope then it shall be neither unlawful, nor unfit for me, either to take notice, or to make use of them. Why then you may be pleased to know, They would have another Translation of the Empire from Germany to Spain. They think belike this Emperors line, though in the same House, is not Catholike enough. And if you ask me, how I know this secret, I will not take it up upon any common report, though I well know what that says. But I'll tell you how I know it. Somewhat above four hundred years after Innocentius made his Comment upon the two great Lights, the Sun, and the Moon, the Pope and the Emperor: * a Spanish Friar follows the same re-

semblance between the Monarchies of Rome and Spain, in a Tract of his, intituled: *The Agreement of the two Catholike Monarchies*, and Printed in Spanish in Madrid, Anno 1612.

In the Frontispiece of Title-page of this Book there are set out two Scutcheons: The one bearing the Cross-Keys of Rome: The other the Arms of Castile and Leon, both joyned together with this Motto: *In vinculis pacis*, in the bond of peace. On the one side of this there is a Portraiture resembling Rome, with the Sun shining over it, and darting his beams on S. Peters Keys, with this Inscription:

+ Luminare Majus, the greater Light, that it may govern the City (that is Rome) and the whole world. And on the other side there's another Image designing Spain, with the Moon shining over that, and spreading forth its Rays upon the Spanish Scutcheon, with this Impress: || Luminare minus, the less Light,

that it may be subject to the City (of Rome he means) and so be Lord to govern the whole world besides. And over all this in the top of the Title-page, there is Printed in Capital Letters, Fecit Deus duo Luminaria magna, God made two great Lights.

There follows after in this Author a Discovery at large of this Blazoning of these Arms; but this is the Substance of it, and abundantly enough to shew what is aimed at, by whom, and for whom. And this Book was not stollen out without the will and consent of the State. For it hath Printed before it all manner of Licence, that a Book can well have. For it hath the approbation of Father Pedro de Buyza, of the Company of the Jesuites. Of John de Arcediano, Pro-

* John de Puente, *La Convenientia de las dos Monarquias Catolicas la de la Iglesia Romana, y la del Imperio Espaniol, y defensa de la presidencia de los Reyes Catolicos de Espania a todos los Reyes del mundo*.

+ Luminare
Majus, ut
prestetur urbi &
Orbi.

|| Luminare
minus, ut sub-
datur urbi, &
dominetur Orbi.

vincial of the Dominicans. Of Diego Granero, the Licencier appointed for the Supreme Council of the Inquisition. And some

* Por Orden de los Señores del Consejo Supremo.

† Por Mando del Rey nuestro Señor.

¶ Quoniam Gallicia alat
20000000 bo-
minum. Ex singulis cente-
nis sumendo u-
num colligit

200000 brennorum milium stipendiarum, commoda, parvorum. Proprietas omnis terre Principis metuit nunc
magis à Gallia, quod anguum ab aliis, et patitur omni illi Regnum Universale. ¶ The Campanelle Ecloga
in Principis Galliarum Delphini Narrationem, cum Annot. Discip. Parisiis, 1639. Cum Permissu Superiorum.

N U M. 13.
A.C. p. 60.

But 'tis time to Return. For A.C. in this passage hath been very Careful to tell us of a Parliament, and of Living Magistrates and Judges besides the Law-Books. Thirdly, therefore the Church of England (God be thanked) thrives happily under a Gracious Prince, and well understands that a Parliament cannot be called at all times: And that there are Visible Judges, besides the Law-Books, and One Supreme (long may he be, and be happy) to settle all Temporal differences (which certainly, he might much better perform, if his Kingdoms were well rid of A.C. and his fellows.) And she believes too, That our Saviour Christ hath left in his Church, besides his Law-book the Scripture, Visible Magistrates, and Judges, that is, Archbishops and Bishops, under a gracious King, to govern both for Truth and Peace according to the Scripture, and her own Canons and Constitutions, as also those of the Catholike Church, which cross

* Non est necesse, ut sub christo sit una Regio totius Ecclesie, sed sufficit quod sit plures regentes diversae Provinciae, sicut sunt plures Reges gubernantes plura regna. Ockham. Dial. L. 2. Tract. 1. q. 3. c. 30. ad 1.

N U M. 14:
A.C. p. 60.

not the Scripture, and the Just Laws of the Realm. * But she doth not believe there is any Necessity to have one Pope, or Bishop over the Whole Christian world, more than to have one Emperour over the whole world. Which were it possible, She cannot think fit. Nor are any of these intermediate Judges, or that One, which you would have Supreme, Infallible.

But since a Kingdom, and a Parliament please A.C. so well to patern the Church by, I'll follow him in the way he goes, and be bold to put him in minde, that in some Kingdoms there are divers Businesses of greatest Consequence, which cannot be finally and bindingly ordered, but in and by Parliament. And particularly the Statute-Laws which must bind all the Subjects, cannot be made, and ratified, but there. Therefore according to A.C.'s own Argument, there will be some Businesses also found,

found. (Is not the settling of the Divisions of Christendom one of them?) which can never be well settled, but in a * General Council: (And particularly the making of Canons, which must bide all Particular Christians, and Churchmen, cannot be concluded, and established, but there.) And again, as the Supreme Magistrate in the State Civil, may not abrogate the Law made in Parliament; though he may Dispense with the Sanction, or penalty of the Law quoad hoc &c. nunc, as the Lawyers speak: So in the Ecclesiastical Body, no Bishop, nor the Pope (where his Supremacie is admitted) hath power to disanul, or violate the true and Fundamental Decrees of a General Council, though he may perhaps dispense in some Cases with some Decrees. By all which it appears, though somewhat may be done by the Bishops and Governors of the Church, to preserve the unity and certainty of Faith, and to keep the Church from renting, or for uniting it, when it is rent; yet that in the ordinary way which the Church hath hitherto kept, some things there are, and upon great emergent Occasions may be, which can have no other help, than a lawful, free, and well composed General Council. And when that cannot be had, the Church must pray that it may, and expect till it may, or else reform its self per partes, by National or Provincial Synods. (as hath been said * before.) And in the mean time, it little beseems A. C. or any Christian to check at the wisdom of Christ, if he have not taken the way they think fitting to settle Church-Differences. Or if for the Churches Sin, or Tryal, the way of Compounding them be left more uncertain than they would have it, *that they which are approved may be known*, 1 Cor. 11. 19. But the Jesuite had told me before, that a General Council had adjudged these things already. For so he says.

T 3

* Propter difficultatem Conciliorum Generallium totius Ecclesiae, que sola audeat intripicere corrigitre omnes, ea mala que universalem tamquam Sacramentum manentia diu incorrecta crescunt, &c. Gerson. Declaratio. Difficultatum Veterum Ecclesiasticorum, Tom.

+ Sunt enim indissolubilia Decreta, quibus
reverentia debita est. Prosper. cont. Colla-
torem, t. 1. And Turretin, who says
every thing that may be said for the
Popes Supremacie, yet dares not say,
Papam posse revocare & tollere omnia Sta-
tuta Generalium Conciliorum, sed Aliqua
tantum. Jodee Turret. Summa de Eccles.
fia, L. 3. c. 53. Et postea. Papa non po-
tes revocare Decreta primorum quatuor Con-
ciliorum, qui non sunt nisi Declarativa
anticlericalia. Ibidem. ibid. c. 47. ad 28

S. 24. N. 7. And shall we think that Christ the
Wise King hath not provided, &c.
A. C. n. 66. Where I cannot but
commend either A. C. his Modesty,
that he doth not, or his Cunning, that
he will not go so far as some have
done before him; though in these
words I should say that he were

*words. ¹ Non mihi tunc, sed ² ne pos-
too far. Non videtem Dominus acri-
tus fuisse. ³ ut can reverentia tua lo-
quar ⁴ iste uicinus post se edens Vicarius
reliquisset, qui hoc semper diperit. ⁵ Puis
autem ipsius Vicarius Petrus. ⁶ Et idem
descendens est de Successoribus Petri, cum
ad hanc obsequias regnaretur. ⁷ si post mor-
tale reliquias. Extravagant. Com. Tr. de
trandi Edic. Paris. 1670. ⁸ in coemulo*

to change. I am, however, still not able to bring my new stabilizer to market.

T. 196

C

For said him, that a General Council, Conv. of Trent, had already judged, not the Roman Church, but the Protestants to hold error. That (said the B.) was not a Lawful Council. In that Council there was no lawfulness, nor justice, nor virtue.

S. 27. B. It is true, that you replied for the Council of Trent. And **NUM. I.** my Answer was, not only, That the Council was not Legal, in the necessary Conditions to be observed in a General Council; but also, That it was no General Council, which again you are content to omit. Consider it well. First, is that Council Legal, the Abettors whereof maintain publickly, That it is Lawful for them to conclude any Controversie, and make it be before, and so in your Judgement Fundamental, though it have not, I do not say now, the Written Word of God for Warrant, either in express Letter, or necessary sense and deduction? As all preceding Councils have had, and as all must have that will proceed, but not so much as Probable Testimony from it, may quite extra without the Scripture? Nay secondly, Is that Council Legal, where the Pope, the Chief Person to be Reformed, shall be President in it, and be Chief Judge in his own Cause, against all Law, Divine, Natural, and Humane, in a place not free, but in, or too near his own Dominion? To which all were not called, that had Deliberative, or Consultative Voice? In which none had Suffrage, but such as were sworn to the Pope and the Church of Rome, and professed Enemies to the same. In this Council there was no lawfulness, nor justice, nor virtue. And this the Arras themselves confess to Constantius the Emperour, then seduced to be theirs. S. Athanas. Epis. ad solit. nitem agentes. But then secondly, I do not except against the Popes sitting as President, either at Nice, or Trent. For that he might do, when called, or chosen to it, as well as any other Patriarch, if you consider no more but his sitting as President. But at Nice the Cause was not his own, but Civil, against the Arianwhores at Antioch, whom he then, his own Synodorum, (So unlike he professed in other Councils as well as at Nic.) Hic formulam Fidei in Nicenâ Synodo concipi. And this the Arras themselves confess to Constantius the Emperour, then seduced to be theirs. And S. Athanas. Epis. ad solit. nitem agentes. And so doth of Bellarmino, D. de ecclesi. cœlest. S. Tertius cardinalis, namely, That "t'is lawful to day the Roman Prelat his Right (Jus suum) in calling General Councils, and Presiding in them, in preference of which Right he hath sat for 1500 years; That's but a bold Assertion of the Cardinals, by his leave. For he gives us no proof of it, but his bare word. Whereas the very Antipodal Copies of the Councils, published and pasted by the Romani, themselves, affirm clearly, they were called by Emperors, not by the Pope. And that the Pope did not preside in all of them. And I hope Bellarmino will not expect we should call him wrong against the councils. And most certain it is, that even as Hosius Presided the Council at Nice, and no way else, as the Popes Legate; so also in the second General Council, which was the first of Constantinople, Niphonius Bishop of Constantinople Presided. Concil. Chalced. Act. 6, 135. and Hierosol. in the fifth, which was the first at Ephesus, S. Cyril of Alexandria Presided. And though Pope Calixtus was joined with him, yet he sent none out of the miss to that Council, till many things were therin finished, as appears out All Council. Tom. 2. p. 16, 17. In the fourth, at Chalcedon, the Legates of the Bishop of Rome had the brine place. In the fifth, In the fifth, the legatus Bishop of Constantinople was President. Tharatus Bishop of Constantinople was President. In the sixth, and seventh, the Legates of the Pope were president; yet so, as that almost all the duty of a Moderator or President was performed in the seventh by Tharatus Bishop of Constantinople; as appears manifestly in the Acts of that Council. And since these seven are all the General Councils, which the Greeks and Latins joindly acknowledge; And that in these other Patriarchs and Bishops Presided, as oft at least as the Bishops of Rome; What's become of Bellarmino's Brag, That the Pope hath been possit of this Right of Presiding in General Councils for the space of 1500 years?

all that called for Reformation, or a free Council? And the Pope himself, to shew his Charity, had declared and pronounced the Appellants, Heretics, before they were condemned by the Council. I hope an Assembly of Ecclesiastes are no Lawful Council: and I think the Decrees of such a one, are omni jure nulla, and carry their Nullity with them through all Law.
¶ Leo 10. Bell. Jun. 8. 1520.

Again, Is that Council General, that hath none of the Eastern Churches Consent, nor presence there? Are all the Greeks so become Non Ecclesia, no Church, that they have no interest in General Councils? It numbers indeed among the Subscribers, six Greeks. They might be so by Nation, or by Title, purposely given them; but dare you say they were actually Bishops of, and sent from the Greek Church to the Council? Or is it to be accounted a General Council, that in many Sessions had scarce Ten Archbishops, or Foreys, or Fifty Bishops present? And for the West of Christendom, nearer home, it reckons one English, S. M. Jasp. But Cardinal Poole was there too: And English indeed he was by Birth, but not sent to that Council by the King, and Church of England, but as one of the Papal Legates; And so we finde him in the five first Sessions of that Council: And at the beginning of the Council, he was not Bishop in the Church of England; and after he was Archbisop of Canterbury, he never went over to the Council. And can you prove, that S. M. Jasp went thither by Authority? There were but few of other Nations, and, it may be, some of them reckoned with no more truth, than the Greeks. In all the Sessions under Paul the Third, but two French-men, and sometimes none; as in the six under Julius the third; when Henry II of France protested against that Council. And in the end, it is well known, how all the French (which were then a good part) held off, till the Cardinal of Lorraine was got to Rome. As for the Spaniards, they laboured for many things upon good grounds, and were most unworthy over-born.

To all this A.C. hath nothing to say, but That it is not necessary to the Lawfulness, and Generality of a Council, that all Bishops of the World should be actually present, subscribe, or consent, but that such Promulgation be made, as is morally sufficient to give notice, that such a Council is called, and that all may come, if they will; and that a major part, at least, of those that are present, give assent to the Decrees. I will forget, that it was but p. 59. in which A.C. speaks of all Pastors, and those not only gathered together. And I will easily grant him, that 'tis not necessary that all Bishops in the Christian world be present, and subscribe: But sure 'tis necessary to the Generality of a Council, that some be there, and authorized for all Particular Churches. And to the freedom of a Council, that all that come, may come safe. And to the Lawfulness of a Council, that is Quoted, that is falso.

that all may come unengaged, and not *fettered to a side*, before they sit down to argue, or deliberate. Nor is such a *Promulgation* as A.C. mentions, sufficient, but onely in case of *Contumacy*, and that where they which are called, and refuse to come, have no just Cause for their not coming, as too many had in the Case of *Trent*. And were such a *Promulgation* sufficient for the *Generalness of a Council*; yet for the *Freedom* and the *Lawfulness* of it, it were not. *E. so (said I) would Arrians say of the Council of Nice. The Bishop would not admit the Case to be like.*

§. 28.

B. So indeed you said. And not you alone: It is the Common Objection made against all that admit not every latter Council, as fully as that *Council of Nice*, famous through all the Christian world. In the mean time, nor you nor they consider, that the Case is not alike, as I then told you. If the Case be alike in all, why do not you admit that which was held at *Ariminum*, and the second of *Ephesus*, as well as *Nice*? If you say, (as yours do) It was because the *Pope* approved them not; That's a *true Cause*, but not *adequate*, or *full*. For it was, because the *Whole Church* refused them; * with whom the *Romane Prelate* (standing then entire in the Faith) agreed, and so (for his *Patriarchate*) refused those Councils. But suppose it true, that these *Synods* were not admitted, because the *Pope* refused them; yet this ground is gained, That the Case is not alike for *mens Assent to all Councils*. And if you look to have this granted, That the *Pope* must confirm, or the *Council's* not lawful; we have far more reason to look, that this be not denied, *That Scripture must not be departed from, in † Letter, or necessary sense, or the Council is not lawful.*

^{+ Here A. C. tells us, that the Arrians thought so of the Council of *Nice*, p. 61. Namely, that they departed from Letter, and Sense of Scripture. They said so indeed. But the Testimony of the whole Church, both then, and since, went with the Council against the Arrian. So is it not here against the Protestant for *Trent*. For they offer to be tried by that very *Council of Nice*, and all the Ancient *councils* and *Fathers* of the *Church*, within the first four hundred years, and somewhat farther.}

^{able to prove, had not the first; and so we have no reason to respect the second.}

^{And to what end do your Learned men}

^{* So Stapleton often, but the Fathers quite it be simply * *ab extra*, out of all bound of *Scripture*; but out otherwise. Due extra E. vangelium sunt in their Determinations left both Letter, and Sense of *Scripture*? non defendam. Shew this against the *Council of Nice*, and I will grant so much of}

of the Case to be like. But what will you say, if Constantine required, That things thus brought into Question, should be answered, and solved by Testimony out of Scripture? And the Bishops of the Nicene Council never refused that Rule. And what will you say, if they profess they depart not from it, * but are ready by many Testimonies of divine Scripture to demonstrate their Faith? Is the Case then alike betwixt it, and Trent? Surely no. But you say that I pretended something else, for my not admitting the Case to be alike.

[†]Litterarum di-
vinis inspi-
ratarum testi-
monia. L. 2. in
Syn. Nic. Tom. I.
per Nicolinum.

* Ibia Opus sen-
tentiā. p. 517.
Parati ex S.

Spiritus arbi-
trio per plurima
Divinarum
Scripturarum
testimonia de-
monstrare hoc ita se habere.

F. Pretending that the Pope made Bishops of purpose, for his side. But this the Bishop proved not.

B. No: Nor had I reason to take on me to prove what I said not. I know it will be expected I should prove what I say. And it is hard to prove the purpose of the Pope's Heart. For if it be proved that he made Bishops at that time; that some of them were Titular onely, and had no Livelihood to subsist, but out of his Purse (and so must hang their Judgement at the strings of it;) that some of these thus made were sent to the Council; and sure not without their Errand: yet if the Pope will say, he neither made, nor sent them to over-rule the Holy Ghost at that Meeting, or of purpose for his side, (as no question but it will be said) who can prove it, that is not a Surveyor of the heart? But though the Pope's heart cannot be seen, yet if these, and the like Presumptions be true, it is a great signe that Trent was too corrupt, and factious a Meeting for the Holy Ghost to be at. And sure the Case in this, not alike at Nice.

That which I said was, That Trent could be no Indifferent Council to the Church, the Pope having made himself a strong Party in it. And this I proved, though you be here not onely content to omit, but plainly to deny the Proof. For I proved it thus, (and you || answered not) That there were more Italian Bishops there, then of all Christendom besides. More? Yea more

§. 29.

N U M. 1.

worthy of any Answer, or looking into the Book for it. First, because 'tis onely a Surmise of Adversaries, who are apt to interpret the worst. Secondly, because there might be more Italian Bishops than, as being nearer, yet without any factious Combination with the Pope: As in the Greek Councils more Grecians were present. A. C. p. 62. No proof, or a weak one. Let the Reader Judge that. But why no Proof? Because a Surmise of Adversaries. Is that a Surmise of Adversaries, that is taken out of the Council it self? Is that Council then become Romana divisum, and apt to interpret the worst of it self? Yet but there were more Italian Bishops, as being nearer. Most true. Nearer a great deal than the Grecian Bishops. But the Bishops of France and of some parts of Germany were almost as near as the Italians themselves. And why then came no more of These, that were near enough? Well: A. C. may say what he will. But the Pope remembred well the Councils of Constantine, and Basil, and thought it woldone to make sure work at Trent. For in latar times, (for their own fears, no doubt) the Bishops of Rome have been no great friends to General Councils, especially Free ones: Multi sufficiant, quid nec dissimilauerit Romana Curia, & Concilia fini negligunt, ut possit ad sua voluntatis libetum plenius dominari, & Jura aliarum Ecclesiastarum liberis usurpar. Quid non affiro est verum, sed quia hujusmodi labores infamia, id est, Pet. de Aliaco, Card. Cameracensis L. de Reformato Eccles. in Faficit. rerum capitulo, fol. 204. 4.

|| Here A. C. is angry, and says: This was no Proof, nor

than.

than double. And this I proved out of the Council it self which you had in your hand in *Decimo sexto*; but had no great heart to look it. For where the number of Prelates is expressed, that had Suffrage and Vote in that Council, the *Italians* are set down to be 187; and all the rest make but 83. So that there were more *Italian Bishops* by 104, than of all the rest of Christendom. Sure the Pope did not mean to be over-reached in this Council. And whatsoever became of his *Infallibility* otherwise, he might this way be sure to be *Infallible* in whatsoever he would have Determined: And this, without all doubt, is all the *Infallibility* he hath. So I proved this sufficiently, I think. For if it were not to be sure of a side, give any satisfying Reason; why such a potent Party of *Italians*, more than double to the whole Christian world, should be there? Shew me the like for *Nice*, and I will give it, that the Case is alike between these two Councils.

NUM. 3.

[†] In Concilio Niceno primo ex Occidente soli sunt duo Presbyteri missi ex Italiâ, unus Episcopus ex Gallia, unus ex Hispania, & unus ex Africa. Bellarm. L. 1. de Concil. c. 17.
§ Antepenult.

Here *Bellarmino* comes in to help: But sure it will not help you, that he hath offered at as much against the Council of *Nice*, as I have urged against that at *Trent*. For he tells us, [†] That in the Council at *Nice*, there were as few Bishops of the West present, as were of the East at *Trent*, but five in all. Be it so: Yeo this will not make the Case alike between the two Councils. First, because I press not the disparity in number onely; but with the Pope's carriage, to be sure of a Major part. For it lay upon the Pope to make sure work at *Trent*, both for himself, and his Church. But neither the Greek Church in general, nor any Patriarch of the East, had any private Interest to look to, in the Council at *Nice*. Secondly, because I press not so much against the Council of *Trent*, That there were so exceeding many Bishops of the West, compared with those of the East, (for that must needs be, when a Council is held in the West) but that there were so many more *Italians*, and Bishops obnoxious to the Pope's power, than of all Germany, France, Spain, and all other Parts of the West besides. Thirdly, because both *Bellarmino* and *A.C.* seek to avoid the Dint of this Argument, by comparing the Western with the Eastern Bishops, and are content to say nothing about the Excessive number of *Italians*, to others of the West: That will receive a fuller Answer than any of the rest. For though very few Western Bishops were at the Council of *Nice*, being so remote: yet at the same time Pope *Sylvester* held a Council at *Rome*, in which He with 275 Bishops of the West confirmed the Nicene Creed; * and Anathematized all those which should dare to dissolve the Definition of that Holy, and Great Council. Now let *Bellarmino*, or *A.C.* or any else shew, That when the Council of *Trent* sate, there was another Council (though never so privately in regard of their miserable Oppression) which sate in *Greece*, or any where in the East, under any

* Omnis qui aucti suavitatis dissolvere iussit
Concil. Rom. 3. sub Sylvestro. Apud Binium,
P. 449.

Patriarch or Christian Bishop, which did confirm the *Canons* of the Council of Trent, and anathematize them which admitted them not, and I will confess they speak home to the Comparison between the Councils, else a blinde man may see the difference, and 'tis a vass one.

But here A.C. makes account he hath found a better Reply to this; and now tells us, that neither French, nor Spanish, nor Schismatical Greeks did agree with Protestants in those Points which were defined in that Council, especially after it was confirmed by the Pope; as appears by the Censure of Jeremias the Greek Patriarch. Who agreed with the Protestants in the Points defined by that Council, (as he speaks) or rather (to speak properly) against the Points there defined; I know not. And for ought A.C. knows, many might agree with them in heart, that in such a Gouncil durst not open themselves. And what knows A.C. how many might have been of their Opinion in the main before the Council ended, had they been admitted to a fair, and a free Dispute? And it may be too, some Decrees would have been more favourable to them, had not the care of the Popes Interest made them sowerer. For else what mean these words, *Especially after it was confirmed by the Pope?* As for Jeremias, 'tis true, his Censure is in many things against the Protestants: But I finde not that that Censure of his is warranted by any Authority of the Greek Church; Or that he gave the Protestants any hearing, before he passed his Censure. And at the most, it is but the Censure of a Schismatique, in A.C.'s own Judgement. And for his flourish which follows, *That East and West would condemn Protestants for Hereticks;* I would he would forbear Propheſying, till both parts might meet in a free General Council, that sought Christ more than themselves. But I finde the Jesuite hath not done with me yet, but addes:

F. In fine, the B. wifed, That a Lawful General Council were called to end Controversies. The persons present said, That the King was inclined therunto, and that therefore we Catholikes might do well to concur.

B. And what say you to my Wifb? You pretend great love to the Truth, would you not have it found? Can you, or any Christian be offended, that there should be a good end of Controversies? Can you think of a better end, than by a General Council? And if you have a most Gracious King inclined unto it, (as you say it was offered) how can you acquit yourselves, if you do not consent? Now here A.C. marvels what A.C. p. 62
kinde of General Council I would have, and what Rules I would have observed in it, which are morally like to be observed, and make an end of Controversies better then their Catholike General

Councils. Truly I am not willing to leave A. C. unsatisfied in anything. Nor have I any meaning to trouble the Church with any New Devising of mine. Any General Council shall satisfie me, (and, I presume, all good Christians) that is lawfully called, convened, and ended according to the same course, and under the same * Conditions, which General Councils observed in the Primitive Church; which I am sure were Councils General, and Catholike, what ever yours be. But I doubt that after all noise made about these Requisite Conditions, A. C. and his Fellows will be found as much, if not more defective in performance of the Conditions, than in the Conditions themselves. Well; the Jesuite goes on, for all this.

* Ex iis Conciliis que adiutoria consilia Generalia fuerunt, qualia sunt quatuor prima: Et ex consuetudine Ecclesie colligimus quatuor Conditions requiri, & sufficiente. Bellar. 1. de Concil. c. 17. § 2.

§ 31.

B. I presume you do not expect I should enter into the Proof of this Controversie, *Whether a General Council may erre in Determination, or not?* Your self brought no Proof that it cannot; and till that be brought, my speech is good that it can; and yet I hope to be found no Infringer of any Power given by Christ to his Church. But it seems by that which follows, you did by this Question (*Can a General Council erre?*) but seek to win ground for your other, which follows,

F. *If a General Council may erre, what nearer are we then (said I) to unity, after a Council hath determined? Ter (said he) although it may erre, yet we should be bound to hold with it, till another come to reverse it.*

§ 32.
NUM. 1:

B. Whether a General Council may erre, or not, is a Question of great Consequence in the Church of Christ. To say it cannot erre, leaves the Church not onely without Remedy against an Errour once determined; but also without sense that it may need a Remedy, and so without care to seek it; which is the misery of the *Church of Rome* at this day. To say it can erre, seems to expose the members of the Church to an uncertainty and wavering in the Faith, to make unquiet Spirits, not onely to disrespect former Councils of the Church, but also to slight and contemn whatsoever it may now Determine; into which Errour some Opposers of the *Church of Rome* have fallen. And upon this is grounded your Question, *Wherein are we nearer to unity, if a Council may erre?* But in relating my Answer to this, you are not so candid: for my words did not sound as yours seem to do, *That we should hold with the Council, erre, or not erre, till another came to reverse it.* As if Grounds of Faith might vary at the Racket, and be cast of each side, as a cunning hand might lay them. You

You forget again, omit at least (and with what minde, you N U M. 2. best know) the *Caution* which I added. For I said, The Determination of a General Council erring was to stand in force, and to have External Obedience at the least yeelded to it, till * *Evidence of Scripture, or a Demonstration to the Contrary* made the Errour appear; and until thereupon another Council of equal Authority did reverse it. And indeed I might have returned upon you again: If a *General Council* not Confirmed by the Pope may erre (which you affirm) to what end then a *General Council*? And you may answer, Yes: For although a *General Council* may erre, yet the Pope, as Head of the Church, cannot. An excellent means of Unity, to have all in the Church as the Pope will have it, what ever *Scripture* lay, or the Church think. And then I pray, to what end a *General Council*? Will his Holiness be so holy, as to confirm a *General Council*, if it determine against him? And as for || Bellarmine's Reasons why a *General Council* should be useful, || Bellar. L.4. if not necessary, though the Pope be Infallible; they are so weak de Rom. Post. c.7. § 3. &c.

Here A. C. tells me, *The Caution mentioned, as omitted, makes N U M. 3. my Answer worse than the Jesuite related it. And that in two A.C. p. 63, 64. things. First, in that the Jesuite relates it thus: Although it may erre: but the Caution makes it, as if it did actually erre. Secondly, in that the Jesuite relates, That we are bound to hold it, till another come to reverse it; that is, we not knowing whether it do erre or not, but onely that it may erre. But the Caution puts the Case so, as if the Determination of a General Council actually erring were not ipso jure invalid, but must stand in force, and have external Obedience yeelded to it, till not onely moral Certainty, but Evidence of Scripture, or a Demonstration to the Contrary, make the errorour appear; And when it appears, we must yeeld our Obedience, till a Council of equal Authority reverse it, which perhaps will not be found in an whole Age. So either the Jesuite relates this speech truly, or less disgracefully. And A. C. thinks, that upon better Judgement, I will not allow this Caution. Truly I shall not thank the Jesuite for*

* § 33. Confid. 5. Num. 1, 2. And the Reason of this is, Because to have a *General Council* deceived, is not impossible; But altogether impossible it is, that *Demonstrative Reason, or Testimony Divine*, should deceive. Hook. L.2. Ecc. Pol. § 7.

† In which Case *Maldonat* puts in the shrewdest Argument: Namely, that this way we should never have a certain end of Controversies. For to try whether any thing were Decreed according to the Word of God by one General Council, we should need another Council; and then another to try that; and so in infinitum. So our faith should never have where to settle and rest it self. *Maldon.* in S. Matth. 18 20. But to this I answer, That the Ancient Church took this way, as will afterward appear in S. *Augustine*. Next, there is no uncertainty at all: For no General Council lawfully called, and so proceeding, can be questioned in another, unless it so fall out, that *Evident Scripture, or a Demonstration* appear against it. But either of these are so clear and manifest, that there need be no fear of proceeding in infinitum, and leaving the Faith in uncertainty, in necessaries to salvation. And in curious Speculations, it is no matter, whether there be certainty or no, with or without a Council. § 33. Confid. 5. Num. 1. & 2.

any his kindness here. And for the *Caution*, I must and do acknowledge it mine, even upon *advisement*, and that whether it make my Answer worse, or better. And I think farther, that the *Jesuite* hath no great *Caufe* to thank *A. C.* for this Defence of his Relation.

NUM. 4.

A. C. p. 62.

First then the *Jesuite* (so says *A. C.*) doth in his *Relation* make it but a *supposition*, That a *General Council* may erre. But the *Caution* expresses it as *actually* erring. True, But yet I hope this Expression makes no *General Council* *actually* erre. And then it comes all to one, whether I suppose that such a Council *may erre*, or that it *do erre*. And 'tis fitter for clearing the Difficulties into which the Church falls in such a Case, to suppose (and more then a *supposition* it is not) a *General Council* **actually erring then as only under a Possibility of Erring*. For the Church hath much more to do to vindicate it self from such an Error actually being, than from any the like Error that might be.

NUM. 5.

A. C. p. 63.

Secondly, *A. C.* thinks, he hath got great advantage by the words of the *Caution*, in that I say, *A General Council erring is to stand in force, and have external Obedience*, at least so far as it consists in silence, Patience, and forbearance yeelded to it, till *Evidence of Scripture, or a Demonstration to the Contrary make the Error appear, and until thereupon another Council of equal Authority did reverse it*. Well ! I say it again. But is there any one word of mine in the *Caution*, that speaks of our *knowing* of this Error? Surely not one (that's *A. C.*'s Addition.) Now suppose a *General Council* actually Erring in some Point of Divine Truth, I hope it will not follow that this Error must be so gross, as that forthwith it must needs be known to private men. And doubtless till they know it, Obedience must be yeelded; Nay when they know it (if the Error be not manifestly against *Fundamental verity*, in which case a *General Council* cannot easily erre) I would have *A. C.* and all wise men Consider, Whether *External Obedience* be not even *then* to be yeelded. For if *Controversies* arise in the Church, some end they must have, or they'll tear all in sunder. And I am sure no *misdome* can think that fit. Why then say a *General Council* Err, and an *Erring Decree* be *ipso jure*, by the very Law it self *invalid*; I would have it wisely considered again, whether it be not fit to allow a *General Council* that Honour and Priviledge, which all other *Great Courts* have. Namely, That there be a Declaration of the Invalidity of it's *Decrees*, as well as of the *Laws* of other Courts, before private men can take liberty to refuse *Obedience*. For till such a declaration, if the *Council* stand not in force, *A. C.* sets up Private Spirits to control *General Councils*; which is the thing he so often, and so much cryes out against in the *Protestants*. Therefore it may seem very fit and

and necessary for the Peace of Christendome, that a General Council thus erring should stand in force, till Evidence of Scripture, or a Demonstration make the Errour

to appear, * as that another Council of equal Authority reverse it.

For as for Moral Certainty, that's not strong enough in Points of Faith. (which alone are spoken of here.)

And if another Council of equal Authority cannot be gotten together in an Age, that is such an Inconveniencie, as the Church

must bear, when it happens. And far better is that inconveniencie than this other, + that any Antho-

rity less than a General Council, should rescind the Decrees of it, unless it erre manifestly, and intolerably.

Or that the whole Church upon peaceable, and just complaint of this Errour,

neglect or refuse to call a Council, and examine it. And there come in National or Provincial Councils to reform for them-

selves. But no way must lye open to private men to * Re-

fuse obedience, till the Council be heard, and weighed,

as well as that which they say against it; yet with + Bellarmine's

Exception still: so the error be not manifestly intolerable. Nor

is it fit for Private men, in such great Cases as this, upon which

the whole peace of Christendome depends, to argue thus: The Er-

ror appears. Therefore the Determination of the Council is ipso

jure invalid. But this is far the safer way (I say still, when

the Errour is neither Fundamental, nor in it self manifest) to

argue thus: The Determination is by equal Authority, and that

secundum jus, according to Law declared to be invalid; There-

fore the Errour appears. And it is a more humble and con-

scientious way, for any private man to suffer a Council to go be-

fore him, then for him to out-run the Council. But weak

and Ignorant mens out-running both God, and his Church, is

as bold a fault now on all sides, as the daring of the Times hath

made it Common. As for that which I have added concerning

the Possibility of a General Councils erring, I shall go on with

it, without asking any farther leave of A. C.

For upon this Occasion I shall not hold it amiss a little more at

large to Consider the Poynt of General Councils, How they may,

or may not erre; And a little to look into the Romane and Pro-

testant Opinion concerning them, which is more agreeable to

the Power and Rule which Christ hath left in his Church; and

which is most preservative of Peace established, or ablest to re-

duce perfect unity into the Church of Christ, when that poor

Ship hath her ribs dashed in sunder by the waves of Contention.

And this I will adventure to the World, but only in the Nature

of a Consideration, and with submission to my Mother the Church

of England, and the Mother of us all, the Universal Catholick

Church

* It is not long since A. C. compared Councils to Parliaments; it was but p. 66. And I hope a Parliament and the Acts of it will stand in force, though something be mistaken in them, or found herein, by another Parliament of equal Authority reverse it and them. For I presume you will not have any inferior Authority to abrogate Acts of Parliament.

+ S. 33. com.
sd. 4. Num. 1.

|| reform for them- || S. 24. Num. 1.

* Re- * S. 38. Num. 15.

+ Non est insi-
cium judicare
an. Superiores
legitime pro-
ducere necne, nmp
manifestissime
confitetur inole-
tabilem Errorum
committi. Bel.

L. 2. de concil.
c. 8. § Alii
dicunt Conci-
lium, Ni si
manifest con-
fiter. Jacob. Al-
main in 3 sent.
D. 24. q. unius,
fne.

Church of Christ; As I do most humbly All whatsoever else is herein contained.

Consid. 1. First then, I Consider, whether all the Power, that an *Oecumenical Council* hath to Determine, and all the Assistance it hath, not to erre in that Determination, it hath it not all from the

* *Si Ecclesia Universitati non est data illa Authoritas,*
Ego neque Concilio Generali, quatenus Ecclesiam Uni-
versalem representat. Bellarm. Lib.2. de Concil. c.16.
S. Quod si Ecclesia.

† *Concilium Generale Ecclesiam representans. Ja. Al-*
main. in 3 Sent. D. 24. Q. 1. ad 1. Episcopi sunt Ec-
clesia representativi, ut nostri loquuntur. Bellarm.
Lib.3. de Eccles. Milit. c.14. S 3.
|| *S 26. Num.8.*

* *Catholike Universal Body of the*
Church, and Clergie in the Church,
whose t Representative it is? And
it seems it hath. For the Govern-
ment of the Church being not
|| *Monarchical, but as Christ is Head,*
this Principle is inviolable in Na-

ture: Every Body Collective that represents, receives power and
priviledges from the Body which is represented; else a Repre-
sentation might have force without the thing it represents; which
cannot be. So there is no Power in the Council, no Assistance
to it, but what is in, and to the Church. But yet then it may

* *Omnis repre-*
sentatio virtute
minor est. Re ip-
sae, vel Veritate,
cujus Represen-
tatio est. Colli-
gitur aperte ex
Thom. 1. 2. q.
101. A.2. ad 2.

And suppose it hath all the *Legal* power, yet it hath not all the *Natural*, either of strength, or wisdom, that the whole hath.

Now because the *Representative* hath power from the *Whole*, and the *Main Body* can meet no other way; therefore the *Acts*, *Laws*, and *Decrees* of the *Representative*, be it *Ecclesiastical*, or *Civil*, are *Binding* in their *Strength*. But they are not so certain, and free from *Error*, as is that *Wisdom* which resides in the *Whole*. For in *Assemblies* merely *Civil*, or *Ecclesiastical*, all the able and sufficient men cannot be in the *Body* that *Represents*; And it is as possible, so many able t and sufficient men (for some particular busines) may be left out, as that they which are in, may miss, or mis-apply that *Reason*, and *Ground*, upon which the *Determination* is principally to rest. Here, for want of a clear view of this ground, the *Representative Body* erres; whereas the *Represented*, by virtue of those *Members* which saw and knew the ground, may hold the *Principle* inviolated.

Consid. 2. Secondly, I Consider, That since it is thus in *Nature*, and in *Civil Bodies*, if it be not so in *Ecclesiastical* too, some reason must be given why; || For that *Body* also consists of *men*: Those *men* neither all equal in their perfections of *Knowledge* and *Judgement*, whether acquired by *Industry*, or rooted in *Nature*, or *infused* by *God*. Not all *equal*, nor any one of them *perfect*, and *absolute*, or freed from *passion* and *humane infir-*
mities. Nor doth their meeting together make them *Infallible* in all things, though the *Act* which is hammered out by many together, must in reason be *perfecter*, than that which is but the *Childe* of one mans sufficiency. If then a *General*
Can-

|| *Ecclesia est*
unum Corpus
mysticum per
Similitudinem
ad Naturam.
Durand. 3. D.
14. Q. 2. N. 5.
Biel. Lef. 23.
in Can. Miss.

Council have no ground of Not erring from the *Men*, or the *Meeting*, either it must not be at all, or it must be by some assistance and power upon them, when they are so met together : And this, if it be less than the Assistance of the *Holy Ghost*, it cannot make them secure against Error.

Thirdly, I Consider, That the Assistance of the *Holy Ghost* Consid. 3. is without Error; That's no Question; and as little there is, NUM. 1. That a Council hath it. But the Doubt that troubles, is, Whether all the assistance of the *Holy Ghost* be afforded in such a High manner, as to cause all the Definitions of a Council in matters Fundamental in the Faith, and in remote Deductions from it, to be alike Infallible? Now the Romanists, to prove there is * infallible assistance, produce some places of Scripture 3. * omnem veritatem infalli-
but no one of them infers, much less infers an *Infallibility*. tatem infalli-
The places which Stapleton there rests upon, are these; a *I will* later docendi,
send you the Spirit of Truth, which will lead you into all Truth. Et. Stapl. Ro-
And, b *This Spirit shall abide with you for ever.* And, c *Behold* Et. St. ad
I am with you to the end of the world. To these, others add: d *The founding of the Church upon the Rock, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail.* And, Christ's Prayer for S. Pe-
ter, e *That his Faith fail not.* And Christ's Promise, That f where, S. Luk. 22.32
two or three are gathered together in his Name, he will be in the f S. Mat. 18.20
midst of them. And that in the g *Acts:* It seemed good to the g Acts 15.28.
Holy Ghost, and to us.

For the first, which is, *Leading into all truth, and that for N U M. 2.*
ever. * All, is not always universally taken in Scripture. Nor * Prosp. de vo-
is it here simply for All Truth: For then a General Council cat. Gent. L.1.
could no more erre in matter of Fact, than in matter of Faith;
in which yet + your selves grant it may erre. But into All || Truth, is a limited all: Into all Truth absolutely necessary to Salvation: And this, when they suffer themselves to be led by the Blessed Spirit, by the Word of God. And all Truth which Christ had before (at least fundamentally) delivered unto them: h He b S. Joh. 16.14
shall receive of mine, and shew it unto you. And again, i He shall i S. Joh. 14.26
teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance,
which I have told you. And for this necessary Truth too, the Apostles received this Promise, not for themselves, and a Coun-
cel, but for themselves, and the* whole Catholike Church; of which a Council, be it never so General, is a very little part. Yea, and this very Assistance is not so absolute, nor in that man-
ner to the whole Church, as it was to the Apostles; neither doth Christ in that place speak directly of a Council, but of his Apostles Preaching, and Doctrine.

As for Christ's being with them unto the end of the world, N U M. 3.
the

* Bellarm. 2. de Concil. 5. 8. § Respondes quidam
Where he saith, ubi Quodlibet est de Facto, non de Jure
¶c. In ejusmodi Iudicium concilium error posse non est
dubium.
¶ Dubium est an illud docebit omn'a, S. Joh. 14. 25.
referendum sit ad illud, Quaecumq; dixi vobis: quod
non aliud docendum Spiritum Sanum dicar, quod quod
ipse aucto docuerit, non repugnabit, si quis ita vult in-
terpretari, &c. Maldonst. in S. Joh. 14.

+ Bellarm. 2.
de Concil. 9. §
Alteram. Assi-
stentia Sp. San-
cti non est pro-
pria concilii sed
universam Ec-
clesiam.

the Fathers are so various, that in the sense of the Ancient Church, we may understand him present in Majestie, in

- * S. Aug. Tr. 50. in S. Joh. Isidor. l. Sent. cap. 14.
- + S. Hilar. in Psal. 124. Justin. Martyr. Dial. cum Tryphon. Prosp. Epist. ad Demetriadem.
- || S. Hilar. in Psal. 124. Prosp. Lib. 2. de vocat. Gent. cap. 2. Leo Serm. 2. de Resurrec. Dom. cap. 3. Isidor. in Joh. c. 21.

Power, in Aye and || Assistance, against the Difficulties they should finde for

Preaching Christ; which is the native sense, as I take it. And this Promise was made to support their weakness. As for his Presence, in teaching by the Holy Ghost, * few mention it; and no one of them which doth, speaks of any Infallible Assistance, farther than the succeeding Church keeps to the Word of the Apostles, as the Apostles kept to the Guidance of the Spirit. Be-

- + S. Hilar. in Psal. 124. S. Cyril L. 7. Dial. de Trin. S. Aug. 6. de Gen. ad 1. 1. 8. S. Leo Sym. 10. de Nat. Dom. c. 5. Isid. in Joh. c. 12. In all which places, *Vobis* cum is either interpreted *suis*, or *Fidelibus*, or *Universal Ecclesia*.

sides, the + Fathers refer their Speech to the Church Universal, not to any Council, or Representative Body.

- || Hos colligitur, sed queritur. And || Maldonate addes, That this His presence by man quid colligitur, sed quid est. Maldonat. in S. teaching, is, or may be a Collection from the place, Mat. 28.

but is not the Intention of Christ.

NUM. 4. For the Rock upon which the Church is founded, which is the * 1 Cor. 3. 11. next Place, we dare not lay any other Foundation, than * Christ: + Ephel. 2. 20. Christ laid his + Apostles, no question, but upon Himself. With these S. Peter was laid, no man questions, and in prime place of Order, (would his claiming Successours be content with that) as appears, and divers Fathers witness, by his particular desigment, *Tu es Petrus*; But yet the Rock even there spoken of, is not S. Peter's person, either only, or properly, but the Faith which he professed. And to this, besides the Evidence, which

- || S. Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph. Qui suam firmavit Ecclesiam super Petram, edificatione spirituali. S. Hilar. l. 6. de Trin. Super hanc igitur Confessionem Petram Ecclesiae edificatio est. Et paulo post: Hoc Fides Ecclesiae fundamentum est. S. Greg. Nyss. de Trin. aduersus Iudeus: Super hanc Petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam, super Confessionem videlicet Christi. S. Isid. Pelus. Epist. l. 1. Epist. 23. Ut hac ratione certam omnibus Confessionem tradere, quam ab eo inspiratus Petrus tanquam Basis, ac Fundamentum fecit, super quod Dominus Ecclesiam suam extruxit. S. Cyril. Alexand. de Trin. l. 4 Petram opinor per agnominationem, alius nihil quam inconcussam & firmissimam Discipuli fidem vocavit, in qua Ecclesia Christi ita fundata, & firmata est, ut non laboretur, &c. B. Theodor. in Cant. Petram appellat fideli pietatem, veritatis professionem, &c. Et super hanc Petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam. S. Greg. Epist. l. 3. Ep. 33. In vera fide persistit, & vitam vestram in Petram Ecclesie, hoc est, in Confessione B. Petri Apostolorum Principis solidare. Theophylact. in Matth. 16. Super eum edificavit Ecclesiam, quia enim confessus erat, &c. quia hoc Confessum est, &c. 9. Aug. in 1 Epist. S. Joh. tral. 10. Quid est, Super hanc Petram? Super hanc Fidem, super id quod dictum est, Tu es, &c. S. Bas. Seleuc. Orat. 25. Hanc Confessionem cum nominasset Christianus Petrum nuncupat eum qui primam illam est confessus, donans illi hanc appellationem tanquam insigne, & monumentum biujus confessionis. Hac eum est revera Pietatis Petra, hec salutis basis, &c. S. Jacob. Liturg. En. 7. N. Pet. & Alex. p. 26. &c. And some which joins the person of S. Peter, profess it is proper tabub Confessus. Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. S. Chrysost. Hom. 2. in Psal. 50. S. Ambros. L. 10. in S. Iac. c. 24. And S. Greg. gives it for a Rule, when Petra is read in the singular number, (and so it is here) Christus est, Christ is signified.

* Non deficit. S. Bern. Serm. 79. in Cant. And Bellarmine himself going to prove Ecclesiam non posse deficere, begins with this very place of Scripture, L. 3. de Eccles. c. 13.

+ Bellar-

^{t L.3. de Ecel.c.}
† Bellarmine be true, That there are many things, even de fide, of the Faith, which yet are not necessary to salvation. Besides, even here again, the Promise of this stable edification, is to the whole Church, not to a Council, at least no further than a Council builds, as a Church is built, that is, upon Christ.

<sup>14. S Quinto.
fielet. Multa
sunt de Fide, que-
non sunt absolute
necessaria ad
salutem.</sup>

The next Place is Christ's Prayer for S. Peter's Faith. The ^{na-} N U M. 3. ^{tive sense of which Place is, That Christ prayed, and obtained for S. Peter perseverance in the grace of God, against the strong temptation, which was to winnow him above the rest. But to conclude an Infallibility hence in the Pope, or in his Chair, or in the Romane Sea, or in a General Council, though the Pope be President, I finde no one Ancient Father that dare adventure it. And * Bellarmine himself, beside some Popes, in their own Cause (and that in Epistles counterfeit, or fallly alledged) hath not a Father to name for this sense of the Place, till he come down to Chrysologus, Theophylact, and S. Bernard: of which Chrysologus his speech is but a flash of Rhetorick; and the other two are men of yesterday, compared with Antiquity, and lived when (it was God's great grace, and Learned mens wonder) the corruption of the time, had not made them corrupter than they are. And † Thomas is resolute, That what is meant here beyond S. Peter's Person, is referred to the whole Church. And the Gloss upon the Canon-Law is more peremptory than he; even to the Denial, that it is meant of the Pope. And if this Place warrant not the Popes Faith, where is the Infallibility of the Council that in your Doctrine depends upon it?}

<sup>* Lib. 4. de Rom:
Pont. cap. 3.</sup>

The next Place is Bellarmine's choice one, and his first; and N U M. 6, he says 'tis a proper place for Proof of the Infallibility of General Councils. This Place is Christ's Promise: Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them, ^b S. Matth. 18. And he tells us, The strength of the Argument is not taken from these words alone, but as they are continued with the former; and ^c that the Argument is drawn à Minori ad Majus, from the less to the greater. Thus ^d If two or three gathered together in my Name, do always obtain that which they ask at Gods hands; to wit, wisdom and knowledge of those things which are necessary for them: How much more shall all the Bishops gathered together (in a Council) always obtain wisdom and knowledge to judge those things, which belong to the direction of the whole Church? I answer ^e First, 'tis most true, that here is little

<sup>a Testimonia propria sunt tria. Primum est Mat. 18.
¶ Bellarm. L. 2. de Concil. c. 2. § 4. Sed con-
trà, Firmitas Conciliorum propriè non innatur
bis verbis. Stapl. Relat. Controvers. 6. q. 4. A. 4.
ad 4. Locus hic non debet hoc propriè accommo-
dari. Valentia in Tho. Tom. 3. Disput. I. R. 1. Punctio
7. S. 45.</sup>

^{b S. Matth. 18. 19,20.}

<sup>c Additiā Argumentatione à Minori ad Majus, &c.
Bellarm. L. 2. de Concil. c. 2. § 4. Et Stapl. Relat.
cont. 6. q. 3. A. 4.</sup>

<sup>d Si duo vel tres congregati in nomine meo obtinent
semper quod petunt à Deo, &c. Bellarm. ibid. § 5.</sup>

strength, in these words alone. For, though the *Fathers* make different interpretations of this place of Scripture, yet ^{*most} of them agree in this, That this Place is to be understood of *Consent in Prayer*. And this is manifest enough in the *Text* it self. *Secondly*, I think there is as little strength in them by the Argument drawn à *Minori ad Majus*. And that I prove two ways. *First*, Because though that Argument hold in *Natural*, and *Necessary things*; yet I doubt it holds not either in *Voluntary*, or *Promised things*, or things which depend upon their *Institution*. For he that promises the less, doth not hereby promise the greater; and he which will do the less, will not always do the greater. *Secondly*, Because this Argument from the less to the greater, can never follow, but where, and so far as the thing upon which the Argument is founded, agrees to the less. For if it do not always agree to the less, it cannot necessarily pass from thence to the greater. Now that upon which this Argument is grounded here, is *Infallible hearing, and granting the Prayers of two or three met together in the Name of Christ*. But this *Infallibility* is not always found in this Less Congregation, where two or three are gathered together. For they often meet, and pray, yet obtain not, because there are divers other Conditions necessarily required (as S. Chrysostom † observes) to make the Prayers of a Congregation heard, beside their gathering together in the Name of Christ. And therefore it is not extended to a greater Congregation, or Council, unless the same Conditions be still observed. Neither doth Christ's Promise, *Ero in Medio*, I will be in the midst of them, infer, That they, the greater or the less, three or three hundred, have all, even necessary things infallibly granted unto them, as oft as they ask, if they ask not as well as they ought, as what they ought. And yet most true it is, that where more or fewer are gathered together in the Name of Christ, there is he in the midst of them; but to assist, and to grant whatsoever he shall finde fit for them, not *Infallibly* whatsoever they ask for themselves. And therefore S. Cyprian,

though he use this very Argument à *Minori ad Majus*, from the less to the greater, yet he presumes not to extend it as *Bellarmino* doth, to the obtaining of *Infallibility*; but onely useth it in the General way, in which there neither is, nor can be doubt of the truth of it. Thus: * If two that are of one minde to Godward, can do so much; what might be done, if there were Unanimity among all Christians? Undoubtedly more, but not All whatsoever they should ask, unless all other Requisites were present.

* Si duo unanimes tantum possunt; Quid, si unanimitas apud omnes esset? S. Cypr. 4. Epist. 4.

Third-

Thirdly, in this their own * Great Champions disagree from Bellarmine, or he from them. For Gregory de Valentia and Stapleton tell us, That this place doth not belong properly to prove an Infallible Certainty of any sentence in which more agree in the Name of Christ: but to the efficacie of Consent for obtaining that which more shall pray for in the Name of Christ, if at least that be for their souls health. For else you may prove out of this Place, That not only the Definition of a General Council; but even of a Provincial, nay of two or three Bishops gathered together is valid, and that without the Popes Assent.

The last Place mentioned for the Infallibility of General Councils is that, Acts 15, where the Apostles say of themselves, Acts. 15. 28. and the Council held by them: It seems good to the Holy Ghost, and to us. And They might well say it: For They had Infallibly the Assistance of the Holy Ghost, and They kept close to his Direction. But I do not finde, that any General Council since, though they did implore (as they ought) the Assistance of that Blessed Spirit, did ever take upon them to say, in terminis, in express terms, of their Definitions: *Vixum est spiritui sancto, & nobis;* It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to Us. Acknowledging even thereby (as I conceive) a great deal of Difference in the Certainty of those things, which a General Council at after Determined in the Church; and those which were settled by the Apostles, when They sat in Council. But though I do not finde, That They used this speech punctually, and in terms; yet the Fathers, when They met in Council, were Confident, and spake it out, That They had Assistance from the Holy Ghost; yet so, as that They neither took Themselves, nor the Councils They sat in, as Infallibly Guided by the Holy Ghost, as the Apostles were. And Valentia is very right:

+ That though the Council say they are gathered together in the Holy Ghost, yet the Fathers are neither Arrogant, in using the speech, nor yet infallible for all that. And this is true, whether the Pope approve, or disapprove their Definitions; Though Valentia will not admit that. The Pope must be (with him) infallible, what ever come of it. Now though this be but an Example, and include no Precept, yet both || Stapleton and * Bellarmine make this Place a proper Proof of the Infallibility of General Councils. And + Stapleton says the Decrees of Councils are the very Oracles of the Holy Ghost; which is little

* Non ad infallibilem certitudinem aliquius sententie, in quam plures in nomine Christi consentiantur, tunc hic Evangelii proprietatem accommodari debet, sed ad efficaciam confessionis plurium ad id imperatitudinem, quod unanimiter in Christi Nomine petunt, si id quidem ad eorum salutem expediat. Secus enim non modo ex illo loco probabitur, &c. Greg. de Valen. tom. a. in Thom. Disput. 1. Q. 1. Punct. 7. § 45. And although Stapleton approves this Argument à Minoris ad Majoris yet withal he says, Firmatas Conciliorum illis Christi verbis proprie non insititur; Quia nec Christus ibi de Concilis Episcoporum loquatur, sed de quaeviis Fidelium unanimi Congregatione. Nec tis, &c. Stapl. Rer. controv. 6. q. 6. A. 4.

+ Quintum Argumentum, &c. Aut sunt ergo Arrogantes, quod putandum non est, Aut infallibiliter definiti. Respondeat Valentia concedendo neutrum, Tom. 3. in Tho. Disp. 1. Q. 1. Punct. 7. § 45.

|| Firmata eorum uisitetur Exempli primi Concilii. Stapl. Rel. Cont. 6. q. 3. A. 4. ad 2.

* Es Bellarm. dicit locam hanc eff. tertium è Propri. L. 2. de Concil. c. 2. § Tertius Locus.

+ Conciliorum Decreta sunt Spiritus Sancti Oracle. Stapl. ibid. Sententia Orthodoxa prima.

* Si illud Concilium ex quo formam accepit etiam omnia Concilia afficerent Decreta sua esse Decreta ipsius Concilii, et idem posse certe testis nonna Concilia, &c. Bellar's ibid.

short of Blasphemy. And * Bellarmine addes, that, Because all other Councils borrowed their form from this, therefore other lawful Councils may affirm also, That their Decrees are the Decrees of the Holy Ghost. Little considering therewhile, That it is one thing to borrow the Form, and another thing to borrow the Certainty, and the Infallibility of a Council. For suppose that After-Councils did follow the Form of that first Council exactly in all Circumstances, yet, I hope, no advised man will say, There is the like Infallibility in other Councils, where no man saie that was Inspired, as was in this, where all, that sat as Judges, were Inspired. Or if any Jesuite will be so bold as to say it, he had need bring very Good Proof for it, and far better than any is brought yet. Now that all Councils are not so Infallible as was this of the Apostles, nor the Canons handled in them, as there

+ Vnde quia prudenter agunt, non precipitas Sententiam, sed sicut explicantur. In rebus enim, Pidit & que conscientiam tangunt, non satis effidere, Volumus Mandamus. Vnde rigitur quomodo Conveniunt Apostoli, simpliciter conveniunt, nibil nisi Deum querunt, & aliorum salutem expectant, &c. Quid igitur mirum si in hac concilio fuerit Spiritus Sanctus &c. Nos aliter Convenimus, neque cum magna pompa, neque ipsorum querimus, neque nobis pollicentur nibil, nuda non licet de Plenitudine Potestatis. Et quomodo Sp. Sanctus ejusmodi crucis probat posset? Ferus in Act. 13.7.

they were, is manifest by + One of their own who tells us plainly, That the Apostles in their Council dealt very prudently, did not precipitate their Judgement, but weighed all things. For in Matters of Faith, and which touch the Conscience, it is not enough to say, Volumus & Mandamus, We Will and Command. And thus the Apostles met together in simplicity and singleness, seeking nothing but God, and the salvation of men. And what wonder if the Holy Ghost were present in such a Council? Nos aliter. But we meet otherwise, in great pomp, and seek our selves, and promise our selves that we may do any thing out of the Plenitude of our Power. And how can the Holy Ghost allow of such Meetings? And if not allow, or approve the Meetings, then certainly not concur to make every thing Infallible, that shall be concluded in them.

NUM. 8:

And for all the Places togehter, weigh them with indifferency, and either they speak of the Church (including the Apostles) as all of them do; And then All grant the Voyce of the Church is Gods Voyce, Divine and Infallible. Or else they are General unlimited, and applyable to private Assemblies as well as General Councils; which none grant to be Infallible, but some mad Enthusiasts. Or else they are limited, not simply into All truth, but All necessary to salvation, in which I shall easily grant a General Council cannot erre, suffering it self to be led by this Spirit of Truth in the Scripture, and not taking upon it to lead both the scripture and the spirit. For Suppose these Places or any other, did promise Assistance even to Infallibility, yet they granted it not to every General Council, but to the Catholick Body of the Church it self; and if it be in the whole Church principally, then is it in a General Council, but by

by Consequent; as the Council represents the Whole. And that which belongs to a thing by consequent, doth not otherwise, nor longer, belong unto it, then it consents and cleaves to that, upon which it is a consequent. And therefore a General Council hath not this Assistance; but as it keeps to the whole Church, and Spouse of Christ, whose it is to hear His word, and determine by it. And therefore if a General Council will go out of the Churches way, it may easily go without the Churches Truth.

Fourthly, I Consider, That All agree, That the Church in General can never erre from the Faith necessary to Salvation: No Persecution, no Temptation, no Gates of Hell (whatsoever is meant by them) can ever so prevail against it: For all the Members of the Militant Church cannot erre, either in the whole Faith, or in any Article of it; it is impossible. For if all might so erre, there could be no union between them, as Members, and Christ the Head: And no Union between Head and Members, no Body, and so no Church; which cannot be. But there is not the like consent, That *General Councils cannot erre. And it seems strange to me, the Fathers having to do with so many Hereticks, and so many of them opposing Church-Authority, that in the Condemnation of those Hereticks, this Proposition, even in terms (*A General Council cannot erre*) should not be found in any one of them, that I can yet see. Now suppose it were true, that no General Council had erred in any matter of moment to this day; which will not be found true: yet this would not have followed, that it is therefore infallible, and cannot erre. I have no time to descend into Particulars, therefore to the General still. S. Augustine † puts a Difference between the Rules of Scripture, and the Definitions of men. This Difference is: Preponitur Scriptura, That the Scripture hath the Prerogative. That Prerogative is, That whatsoever is found written in Scripture, may neither be doubted, nor disputed, whether it be true, or right. But the Letters of Bishops may not only be disputed, but corrected by Bishops that are more learned and wise than they, or by National Councils; and National Councils by Plenary or General: And even || Plenary Councils themselves may be amended, the former by the later. It seems it was no News with S. Augustine, that a General Council might erre, and therefore inferiour to the Scripture, which may neither be doubted, nor disputed, where it affirms. And if it be so with the Definition of a Council too (as *Stapleton would have it) That that may neither be doubted, nor disputed; Where is then the Scriptures Prerogative?

I know there is much shifting about this Place; but it cannot be wrastled off. † Stapleton says first, That S. Augustine speaks of the Rules of Manners, and Discipline: And this is

N. U. M. 2.
† Dr. Augustin
Morum & Dis-
ciplina.
Bellar. q. 3. A. 4.

|| ipsorum plena-
ria sed priora
a posterioribus
emendari.

* Vox Ecclesie
talis est, ut non
de eis iudicemus
rebus a seculis
docuerit. So.
Stapl. Relef.
c. 4. q. 1. A. 11.

Consid. 4.
NUM. 1.
|| S. Mat. 16. 28

Wald. Lib. 2.
Dodd. Pid. An.
2. c. 19. S. 1.
§ 38. Nam. 4.

† Aug. L. a. de
Bapt. contra
Donat. cap. 3.

Bellarmino's last Shift. Both are out, and Bellarmine in a Contradiction. Bellarmine in a Contradiction : For first he tells us, General Councils cannot erre in † Precepts of Manners ; and then, to turn off S. Augustine in this Place, he tells us, That if S. Augustine doth not speak of matter of *Faith*, but of *Right*, and of *universal Questions of Right*, then is he to be understood of * Precepts of Manners, not of Points of Faith : Where he hath first run himself upon a Contradiction; and then we have gained this ground upon him, That either his Answer is nothing ; or else against his own state of the Question, A General Council can erre in Precepts of Manners. So belike when Bellarmine is at a Shift, A General Council can, and cannot erre in Precepts of Manners. And both are out : For the whole Dispute of S. Augustine, is against the Errour of S. Cyprian, followed by the Donatists, which was an Errour in Faith ; Namely, That true Baptism could not be given by Hereticks, and such as were out of the Church. And the Proof which Stapleton and Bellarmine draw out of the subsequent words († When by any experiment of things, that which was shut, is opened) is too weak : For experiment there is not of *Faith* ; nor are the words, Conclusum est, as if it were of a Rule of Discipline concluded, as Stapleton cites them ; but a farther experiment or proof of the Question in hand ; and pertaining to Faith which was then shut up, and as S. Augustine after speaks, || wrapped up in cloudy darkness.

NUM. 3.

¶ Ibid. c. 4. Ne-
bulis involuta.

* Sensus est, quod Concilia posteri-
ora emendant, id est, perfectius ex-
plificant fidem in semini antiqua Do-
ctrina latentem, &c. Stapl. Relat. contr. 6. q. 3. a. 4.

† Quia in re xi.

bil errorum ul-
bus concilium docuit, &c.

‡ Quia in re xi.

bil errorum ul-
bus concilium docuit, &c.

§ Quia in re xi.

bil errorum ul-
bus concilium docuit, &c.

|| Sept.

¶ Sept.

ries. Next, S. Augustine's Dispute is against S. Cyprian and the Council held at Carthage about Baptism by Hereticks ; in which Point, that National Council erred (as now all agree.) And S. Augustine's Deduction goes on : Scripture cannot be other than right ; that is the Prerogative of it : but Bishops may, and be * Reprehended for it, if peradventure they + erre from the Truth ; and that either by more + Si quid in iis Learned Bishops, or by Provincial Councils. Here Reprehension, ^{fond à veritate} and that for deviation from the Truth, is (I hope) Emendation ^{tate deviationum} et. properly, and not Explanation only. Then Provincial Councils, they must || yeeld to General : And to yeeld, is not in case || cedere. of Explanation only. Then it follows, That even Plenary Councils themselves may be amended, the former by the later ; still retaining that which went before, If peradventure they erred, or made deviation from the Truth. And if this be not so, I would fain know, why in one and the same tenour of words, in one and the same continuing Argument and Deduction of S. Augustine, Reprehendi should be in proper sense, and à veritate deviatum in proper sense, and Cedere in proper sense ; and only Emendari should not be proper, but stand for an Explanation ? If you say the Reason is, because the former words are applied to men, and National Councils, both which may erre ; but this last to General Councils, which cannot erre : This is most miserable Begging of the Principle, and thing in Question.

Again, S. Augustine concludes there, That the General Council preceding may be amended by General Councils that follow, || When that is known which lay hid before. Not as Stapleton would have it, Lay hid as in the seed of Ancient Doctrine only, and so needed nothing but explanation ; but hid in some darkness or ambiguity , which led the former into error, and mistaking, as appears : For S. Augustine would have this amendment made without sacrilegious Pride, doubtless, of insulting upon the former Council, that was to be amended ; and without swelling Arrogancy, sure, against the weakness in the former Council ; and without contention of envie, which uses to accompany mans frailty, where his, or his friends Error is to be amended by the later Council ; and in holy Humility, in Catholike Peace, in Christian Charity, no question, that a Schism be not made to tear the Church (as here the Donatists did) while one Council goes to reform the lapse of another, if any be. Now to what end should this Learned Father be so zealous in this work, this highest work, that I know in the Church, Reviewing and Surveying General Councils ; to keep off Pride, and Arrogance, and Envie, and to keep all in Humility, Peace, and Charity ; if after all this noise, he thought later Councils might do nothing, but amend, that is, explain the former ? That

NUM. 5.
|| Quam con-
ficitur quod la-
tebat.

NUM. 6.

* Bellar. L. 2.
de concil. c. 7.
§ Respondeo
primo forte.

That Shift; which * *Bellarmino* addes to these two of *Sta-*
pleton, is poorest of all, namely, *That S. Augustine speaks of un-*
lawful Councils; and it is no question, but they may be amen-
ded, as the second *Epheſine* was at *Chalcedon*. For this Answer
hath no Foundation but a peradventure: Nor durſt *Bellarmino*
rest upon it. And most manifest it is, that *S. Augustine* speaks
of Councils in general, that they may erre, and be amended in
Doctrine of Faith; and in case they be not amended, that then
they be condemned and rejected by the Church, as this of *E-*
pheſus, and divers others were. And as for that meer Trick, of

+ §. 26. N. u. 1. the + *Popes Instruction, Approbation, or Confirmation*, to preserve
it from Errour, or ratifie it that it hath not erred, the most an-
cient Church knew it not. He had his *Suffrage*, as other great
Patriarchs had, and his *Vote* was highly esteemed, not onely for
his Place, but for *worth* too, as *Popes* were then. But that the
Whole Council depended upon him, and his Confirmation, was
then unknown, and I verily thjnk at this day not Believed, by
the Wise and Learned of his Adherents.

Confid. 5.

NUM. 1.
* Ibid.
+ § 32. Num. 5

Fifthly, it must be *considered*, If a *General Councel* may erre,
who shall judge it? *S. Augustine* is at * *priora à posterioribus*,
Nothing sure, that is less then a + *General Councel*. Why, but
this yet lays all open to uncertainties, and makes way for a
Whirlwind of a Private Spirit, to ruffie the Church. No, nei-
ther of these. First, all is not open to *uncertainties*. For *Ge-*
neral Councils lawfully called, and ordered, and lawfully pro-
ceeding, are a *Great and an Awful Representation*, and cannot
erre in matters of Faith, *keeping themselves to God's Rule*, and
not attempting to make a New of their own; and are with all
submission to be observed by every Christian, where *Scripture*,
or evident Demonstration come not against them. Nor doth it
make way for the Whirlwind of a private Spirit: For *private*
Spirits are too giddy to rest upon *Scripture*, and to heady and
shallow to be acquainted with Demonstrative Arguments. And
it were happy for the Church, if she might never be troubled
with Private Spirits, till they brought such Arguments. I know
this is hotly objected against || Hooker, the * *Author* calls him a

¶ Prefat. p. 29.
* Dial. dictus,
Deus & Rex.
† Cordatus
Protestans.

+ Wise Protestant, yet turns thus upon him. If a Councel must
yield to a Demonstrative Proof, Who shall judge, whether the
Argument that is brought, be a Demonstration, or not? For
every man, that will kick against the Church, will say, the
Scripture he urges, is evident, and his Reason a Demonstration.
And what is this, but to leave all to the wildnes of a *Private*
Spirit? Can any ingenuous man read this Passage in *Hooker*,
and dream of a *Private Spirit*? For to the Question, Who shall
judge? *Hooker* answers, as if it had been then made; || *An Ar-*
gument necessary and Demonstrative, is such (saith he) as be-

|| Prefat. p. 29.
And therefore
A. c. is much
to blame after
all this, to talk of a pretext of seeming evident Scripture, or Demonstration; as he doth, p. 59.

ing proposed to any man, and understood, the minde cannot chuse but inwardly assent unto it. So, it is not enough to think or say it is *Demonstrative*. The Light then of a *Demonstrative Argument*, is the Evidence which it self hath in it self to all that understand it. Well; but because all understand it not, If a Quarrel be made, Who shall decide it? No Question, * but a * § 32. Num. 2. *General Council*, not a *Private Spirit*: first, in the intent of the Authour; for Hooker in all that Discourse makes the *Sentence of the Council + binding*: and therefore that is made Judge, not † *Prefat. p. 28.*

a *Private Spirit*. And then for the Judge of the *Argument*, it is as plain: For if it be evident to any man, then to so many Learned men as are in a *Council*, doubtless: And if they cannot but assent, it is hard to think them so impious, that they will define against it. And if that which is thought evident to any man, be not evident to such a grave *Assembly*, it is probable tis no *Demonstration*, and the producers of it, ought to rest, and not to trouble the Church.

Nor is this Hooker's alone, nor is it newly thought on by us. NUM. 2.
It is a Ground in *Nature*, which *Grace* doth ever set right, never undermine. And || S. Augustine hath it twice in one Chapter, || 2 de Bapt. cont. Dom. cap. 4. That S. Cyprian, and that Council at Carthage, would have * nisi verum di- canti, & demon- stranti. it is a Rule with † him, *Consent of Nations, Authority confir- med by Miracles, and Antiquity, S. Peter's Chair, and Success- sion from it, Motives to keep him in the Catholike Church, must not hold him against Demonstration of Truth*; || which if it be so clearly demonstrated, that it cannot come into doubt, it is to be preferred before all those things, by which a man is held in the Catholike Church. Therefore an evident *Scripture*, or Demonstration of Truth must take place every where; but where these cannot be had, there must be Submission to Au- thority.

And doth not Bellarmine himself grant this? For speaking of Councils, he delivers this Proposition, *That Inferiors may not judge, whether their Superiors (and that in a Council) do proceed lawfully, or not*. But then having bethought himself, that Inferiors at all times, and in all Causes, are not to be cast off; he addes this Exception, * Unless it manifestly appear that an intolerable Error be committed. So then, if such an Error be, and be manifest, Inferiors may do their duty, and a Council must yeeld; unless you will accuse Bellarmine too of leaning to a *Private Spirit*: for neither doth he express who shall judge, whether the Error be intolerable.

This will not down with you; but the Definition of a General Council is, and must be infallible. Your Fellows tell us, (and you can affirm no more) That the *Voice of the Church* determining in Council, is not † *Humane*, but *Divine*. That is † *Stapl. Ritef. Cont. 4. Q. 3.* well; Art. 1.

well ; Divine, then sure *Infallible* : yea ; but the Proposition sticks in the throat of them that would utter it. It is not Di-

* *Divina suo modo.* Ibid. And so A.C. too, who hath opened his mouth very wide to prove the Succession of Pastors in the Church, to be of Divine and Infallible Authority, yet in the close is forced to add,

† *In altiori genere, viz. in genere causa efficientis, atque non aequali ex parte formalium.* Ibid. Q. A. q. 3.

vine simply, but in a * manner Divine. Why but then sure not *infallible*, because it may speak loudest in that manner, in which it is not Divine. Nay more : *The Church* (forsooth) is an infallible Foundation of Faith

+ in an higher kinde than the Scripture : For the Scripture is but a Foundation in Testimony, and Matter to be believed ; but the Church is

the efficient Cause of Faith, and in some sort the very formal.

Is not this Blasphemy ? Doth not this knock against all evidence of Truth, and his own Grounds, that says it ? Against all evidence of Truth : For in all Ages, all men that once admitted the Scripture to be the Word of God (as all Christians do) do with the same breath grant it most undoubted and infallible. But all men have not so judged of the *Churches Definitions*, though they have in greatest Obedience submitted to them. And against his own Grounds, that says it

For the Scripture is absolutely, and every way Divine ; the Churches Definition is but *suo modo*, in a sort, or manner Divine.

But that which is but in a sort, can never be a Foundation in an Higher Degree, than that which is absolute, and every way such :

Therefore neither can the Definition of the Church be so Infallible as the Scripture ; much less, *in altiori genere*, in a higher kinde than the Scripture. But because, when all other things fail, you stie to this, That the Churches Definition in a General Council, is by *Inspiration*, and so Divine and Infallible : my haste shall not carry me from a little Consideration of that too.

Confid. 6. Sixthly then, If the Definition of a General Council be infallible, then the Infallibility of it is either in the Conclusion, and in the Means that prove it ; or in the Conclusion, not the Means ; or in the Means, not the Conclusion. But it is infallible in none of these. Not in the first, *The Conclusion and the Means* :

For there are divers Deliberations in General Councils, where the Conclusion is *Catholike* ; but the Means by which they prove it, not infallible. Not in the second, *The Conclusion, and not the Means* : For the Conclusion must follow the nature of the

Premisses or Principles out of which it is deduced ; therefore if those which the Council uses be sometimes uncertain, as is proved before, the Conclusion cannot be Infallible. Not in the third, *The Means, and not the Conclusion* : For that cannot be true and necessary, if the Means be so. And this I am sure you will never grant ; because if you should, you must deny the

Infallibility which you seek to establish.

NUM. 2. To this (for I confess the Argument is old, but can never be worse)

How

worn out, nor shifted off) your great Master * Stapleton (who is miserably hamper'd in it, and indeed so are you all) answers; That the *Infallibility* of a Council is in the second Course, that is, *It is infallible in the Conclusion, though it be uncertain and fallible in the Means, and Proof of it.* How comes this to pass? It is a thing altogether unknown in *Nature*, and *Art* too, That *fallible Principles* can, either father, or mother, beget, or bring forth an *infallible Conclusion*.

+ And herein I must needs commend your Wisdom. For you have had many Popes so ignorant, grossly ignorant, as that they have been no way able to sift, and examine the Means. And therefore you do most advisedly make them infallible in the Conclusion without the Means.

S. 39. Num 8.

NUM. 3.

Well, that is granted in *Nature*, and in all *Argumentation*, that causes Knowledge. But we shall have Reasons for it: || First, because the Church is discursive, and uses the Weights, and Moments of Reason in the Means; but is Prophetical, and depends upon immediate Revelation from the Spirit of God, in delivering the Conclusion. It is but the making of this appear, and all Controversie is at an end. Well, I will not discourse here, To what end there is any use of Means, if the Conclusion be Prophetical; which yet is justly urged: for no good cause can be assigned of it. If it be Prophetical in the Conclusion, (I speak still of the present Church,) for that which included the Apostles, which had the Spirit of Prophecy, and immediate Revelation, was ever Prophetick in the Definition, but then that was *Infallible in the Means*, too) That since it delivers the Conclusion not according to *Nature* and *Art*, that is, out of Principles which can bear it, there must be some *Supernatural Authority* which must deliver this Truth: That (say I) must be the Scripture. For if you fly to immediate Revelation now, the Enthusiasm must be yours. But the Scriptures, which are brought in the very Exposition of all the Primitive Church, neither say it, nor enforce it. Therefore Scripture warrants not your Prophecy in the Conclusion. And I know no other thing, that can warrant it. If you think the Tradition of the Church can make the world beholding to you, Produce any Father of the Church that says: This is an Universal Tradition of the Church, That her Definitions in a General Council are Prophetical, and by immediate Revelation. Produce any one Father that says it of his own Authority, that he thinks so: Nay, make it appear, that ever any Prophet, in that which he delivered from God, as *infallible Truth*, was ever discursive at all in the Means. Nay, make it but probable in the ordinary course of Prophecy, (& I hope, you go no higher, nor will I offer at God's absolute Power) That that which is discursive in the Means, can be Prophetick in the Conclusion, & you shall be my great Apollo for ever. In the mean time, I have learnt this from * yours, That all Prophecy is by Vision, Inspiration, &c. & that no Vision admits discourse: That all Prophecy is an Illumination, not always present, but when the Word of the Lord came to them; & that was not by discourse. And yet you

* Prophete au-
diabant à Dieu
intérieurement. Tho. 2.
2d. q. 5. A. 1.
ad. 3.

The word of the Lord came unto me, is common in the Prophets,

*Stapl. Redct. * say again, That this Prophetick Infallibility of the Church is not gotten without study and Industry. You should do well to tell us too, why God would put his Church to study for the Spirit of Prophecie, which never any Particular Prophet was put unto.

+ Prophetican
Modestiones
ante passus ha-
bitus post, ut
ex Natura, vel
auctio contra
the Authoritatem
Generalium Con-
ciliorum, Aut.
Roch, + He prefers the Conclusion, and the Canon, before the
Acts and the Deliberations of Councils; and so do we: but I do
not remember, that ever he speaks out, That the Conclusion is
delivered by Prophecie, or Revelation. Sure he sounded the
shore, and found danger here. He did find it: For a little
before he speaks, plainly (would his bad Cause let him be con-

Fran. Picus, 2.
Precept. c. 4.
|| 1Cor. 12. 10.
+ L. 2. de Conc.
Ex 23. bid.

* Concilia non habent, que scribuntur
immediatas Revelationes, &c. sed ex
verbo Dei per ratiocinationem deducunt conclusions. Bellar. Lib. 2. de
concil. cap. 12. §. Dicuntur. || What from Inspiration? No: But out of the
Word of God, and that per ratiocinationem, by
Argumentation: Neither have they, nor do
they write any immediate Revelations.

N U M. 4.
† Stapl. Ibid.
374.

The second Reason, why + Stapleton will have it Prophetick in the Conclusion, is, Because that which is determined by the Church, is matter of Faith, not of Knowledge: And that therefore the Church proposing it to be believed, though it use Means, yet it stands not upon Art, or Means, or Argument, but the Revelation of the Holy Ghost: Else when we embrace the Conclusion proposed, it should not be an Assent of Faith, but an Habit of Knowledge. This for the first Part (That the Church uses the Means, but follows them not) is all one in substance with the former Reason. And for the later Part, That then our admitting the Decree of a Council, would be no Assent of Faith, but an Habit of Knowledge; what great inconvenience is there, if it be granted? For I think it is undoubted Truth, That one, and the same Conclusion may be Faith to the Believer, that cannot prove, and Knowledge to the Learned, that can. And || S. Aug^{ustine}, I am sure, in regard of one, and the same thing, even

|| cont. Fund.
c. 4.
* Tho. p. 1. q. 2. A. 3. ad 2. Nihil pro-
hibet illud, quod secundum se demon-
strabile est, & scibile, in aliquo acceptum
ut Credibile, qui Demonstracionem non
capit.

this, the very wisdom of the Church in her Doctrines, ascribes Understanding to one sort of men, and Belief to another weaker sort. And capit. * Thomas goes with him.

N U M. 5.
Now for farther satisfaction, if not of you, yet of others, this may well be thought on. Man lost by sin in the Integrity of his Nature, and cannot have Light enough to see the way to Heaven, but by Grace. This Grace was first merited, after given by Christ: this Grace is first kindled by Faith; by which, if we agree not to some Supernatural Principles, which no Reason can demonstrate simply, we can never see our way. But this Light, when it hath made Reason submit it self, clears the eye of Reason, it ne-
ver

ver puts it out. In which sense, it may be, is *ni modi agnoscit*
 that of * *Opus tuum*, *That the very Catholike Church* *in all Nations & ubique dif-*
it self is reasonable, as well as diffused every where. By which + *Reason enlightened*, (which
 is stronger than Reason) the Church in all Ages
 hath been able, either to convert, or convince,
 or at least || *stop the mouths of Philosophers*, *Aus. Fons. apud Fundament. c. 14.*
 and the great men of Reason, in the very Point *Scriptura. 6. Aug. L 22. cont. Faust.*
 of Faith, where it is at highest. To the pre-
 sent occasion then. The first, immediate, Fundamental Points
 of Faith, without which there is no salvation, as they cannot
 be proved by Reason; so neither need they be determined by
 any Council, nor ever were they attempted, they are so plain
 set down in the Scripture. If about the sense, and true mean-
 ing of these, or necessary deduction out of these Prime Articles
 of Faith, General Councils determine anything, as they have
 done in Nice, and the rest; there is no inconvenience, that one
 and the same Canon of the Council should be believed, as it re-
 flects upon the *Articles and Grounds indemonstrable*; and * yet
 known to the Learned, by the Means and Proof, by which that
 Deduction is vouch'd, and made good. And again, the Con-
 clusion of a Council, suppose that in Nice, about the Consub-
 stantiality of Christ with the Father, in it self considered, is in-
 demonstrable by Reason; There I believe, and assent in Faith: * Almain. 3. D.
 But the same Conclusion, || if you give me ground of Scripture, 24. q. 1. & Tho.
 and the Creed (and somewhat must be supposed in all, whe- 2. 2.e.q. 1. A. 5.
 ther Faith, or Knowledge) is demonstrable by natural Reason, C. Id quod est
 against any Arian in the world. And if it be demonstrable, I scitum ab uno
 may know it, and have an habit of it. And what inconveni- boni etiam in
 ence in this? For he weaker sort of Christians, which cannot
 deduce, when they have the Principle granted, they are to rest
 upon the Definition onely; and their Assent is *meer Faith*: yea,
 and the Learned too, where there is not a Demonstration evi- Belar. 1. 2. de con-
 dent to them, assent by *Faith onely*, and not by *Knowledge*. And cile. c. 12. § Sic
 what inconvenience in this? Nay, the necessity of Nature is
 such, that these Principles once given, the understanding of
 man cannot rest, but it must be thus. And the + Apostle would + s. Pet. 3. 19
 never have required *a man to be able to give a Reason, and an
 account of the hope that is in him*, if he might not be able to
 know his account, or have lawful interest to give it, when he
 knew it, without prejudicing his Faith by his Knowledge. And
 suppose exact Knowledge and meer Belief cannot stand together
 in the same Person, in regard of the same thing, by the same
 means; yet that doth not make void this Truth. For where
 is that exact knowledge, or in whom, that must not merely, in
 points of Faith, believe the Article, or ground upon which they
 rest? But when that is once believed, it can demonstrate many
 things

things from it. And Definitions of Councils are not *Principia Fidei*, Principles of Faith, but Deductions from them.

Confid. 7. And now because you ask, *Wherein are we nearer to Unity by a Council, if a Council may erre?* Besides the Answer given, I promised to consider which Opinion was most agreeable with the Church, which most able to preserve, or reduce Christian Peace: *The Romane, That a Council cannot erre; or the Protestants, That it can.* And this I propose not as a Rule, but leave the Christian world to consider of it, as I do.

NUM. 2. First then I consider, Whether in those places of Scripture before mentioned, or any other, there be promised to the present Church an absolute Infallibility? Or whether such an In-

* Relat. cont. 4. q. 2. Notab. 3. Exaudi & Omnimodā Infallibilitate non indiget, sed satis est semel accepta, &c.

fallibility will not serve the turn, as *Stapleton*, after much wrangling, is forced to acknowledge? One not every way exact: because it is enough, if the Church do diligently insist upon that which was once received: and there is not need of so great certainty to open and explicate that which lies hid in the seed of Faith somē, and deduce from it; as to seek out, and teach that which was altogether unknown. And if this be so, then sure the

Church of the *Apostles* required guidance by a greater degree of Infallibility than the present *Church*; which yet, if it follow the *Scripture*, is Infallible enough, though it hath not the same degree of Certainty which the *Apostles* had, and the *Scripture* hath. Nor can I tell, what to make of *Bellarmino*, that in a whole Chapter disputes five Prerogatives, in Certainty of Truth, + L. 2. de Conc. c. 12. Sunt enim utraque sicut infallibilis veritatis aquaeranda dici possunt. + that the *Scripture* hath above a Council; and at last Concludes, That They may be said to be equally certain in Infallible Truth.

NUM. 3. The next thing I Consider, is: Suppose this not Exact, but congruous: Infallibility in the *Church*; Is it not residing according to Power, and Right of Authority in the whole *Church*? Always understanding the *Church* in this place *pro Communitate Prelatorum, for Church-Governours*; which have *Votes* in *Councils*) and in a *General Council*, onely by Power

¶ Quid si Ecclesiæ universitati non ista data illa Authoritas, ergo nec Concilio Generale, quantum Ecclesiæ Universitatem representat. Bellar. l. 2. Ex his habeamus. * Petrus Personam Ecclesiæ Catholicae sustinet, & hanc data sunt claves, quoniam Petro date. De signo Corin. 3. deputata cum Mandate to determine? The Places of *Scripture*, with Expositions of the Fathers upon them, make me apt to believe this. AS. Peter (faith *S. Augustine) did not receive the Keys of the Church, but as sustaining the person of the Church. Now for this Par-

ticular, suppose the Key of Doctrine be to let in *Truth*, and shut out *Error*; and suppose the Key rightly used, Infallible in this: yet this Infallibility is primely in the *Church Docent*, in whose person (not strictly in his own) S. Peter received the Keys. But here *Stapleton* lays cross my way again, and would thrust me out of this consideration. He grants, that S. Peter received these Keys indeed, and in the Person of the formaliter Petrus accepit.

+ Rel. cont. 6. q. 3. 1. scid mppr. Primatum quem gerebat Ecclesia, dicens et si finaliter Ecclesia accipit, tamen

the Church; but (saith he) that was, because he was Primate of the Church; And therefore the Church received the Keys finally, but S. Peter formally: that is (if I mistake him not) S. Peter for himself, and his successors received the Keys in his own Right; but to this end, to benefit the Church, of which he was made Pastor. But I keep on in my Consideration still. For the Church here is taken pro Communitate Prelatorum, for all the Prelates, that is, for the Church as 'tis Docent, and Regent, as it Teaches, and Governs. For so onely it relates to a General Council. And so *S. Augustine, and Stapleton himself, understand it in the places before alledged. Now in this sense S. Peter received the Keys formally for himself and his Successours at Rome, but not for them onely; but as he received them in the person of the whole Church Docent, so he received them also in their Right, as well as his own, and for them all. And in this sense S. Peter received the Keys in the person of the Church (by Stapleton's good leave) both Finally and Formally. For I would have it considered also, whether it be ever read in any Clasick Author, That to receive a thing in the person of another; or sustaining the person of another, is onely meant Finally to receive it, that is, to his good, and not in his right. I should think, he that receives any thing in the person of another, receives it indeed to his good, and to his use, but in his right too: And that the formal right is not in the receiver onely, but in him or them also, whose person he sustains while he receives it. I'll take one of Stapleton's own Instances: A Consul or prime Senator in an Aristocratical Government (such as the Churches is Ministerially under Christ) receives a Priviledge from the Senate, and he receives it as Primarily, and as Formally for them, as for himself, and in the Senates right as well as his own, he being but a chief part; and they the whole. And this is S. Peter's Case in Relation to the whole Church Docent and Regent, saving that his Place and Power was Perpetual, and not Annual, as the Consul's was. This Stumbling-block then is nothing, and in my Consideration it stands still, That the Church in this Notion by the hands of S. Peter received the Keys, and all Power signified by them; and transmitted them to their Successours, who by the assistance of Gods spirit may be able to use them, but still in and by the same hands, and perhaps to open and shut in some things Infallibly, when the Pope, and a General Council too (forgetting both her, and her Rule, the Scripture) are to seek how to turn these Keys in their Wards.

The third Particular, I Consider, is: Suppose in the whole Catholike Church Militant, an absolute Infallibility in the Prime Foundations of Faith, absolutely necessary to Salvation; and that this Power of not erring so, is not

* com-

* Non omnis illa que tradit Ecclesia sub Definitione Judiciali (i. in Concilio) sunt de Necessitate Salutis credenda, sed illa duntata que sic tradit concurrente Universale totius Ecclesie consensu, implicite, vel explicate, vere, vel interpretative. Gerlon. Tract. de Declaratione veritatum que credenda sunt, &c. S 4. par. 1. p. 472.

† Posset tamen contingere quod quavis Generale concilium definiret aliquid contra Fidem Ecclesie Dei non exponeatur periculo. Quia posset contingere quod congregari in Concilio Generali esset pacis & quietis tam in re, quam in humanum reputatio[n]em, respectu illorum qui ad illud Concilium Generale minime convenienter. Et tunc illorum leviter. Error extirpationem per multitudinem nationum & operacionum & sensorum illius. Quibus atiam multitudine simplicium adhuc erit magis, &c. Ochi. Etsi. p. 3. l. 3. c. 13.

|| Many of these were potent at Ariminum, and Seleucia.

* Determinationibus qua à conciliis vel Pontifici Summa sunt super iis dubitationibus, que substantiam fidei concernant, necessaria credendum est, dum universalis Ecclesia non recusat. Fr. P. Mirand. Theor. 8.

† Artic. 21.

* communicable to a General Council, which represents it, but that the Council is subject to error: This supposition doth not onely preserve that which you desire in the Church, an Infallibility, but it + meets with all inconveniences, which usually have done, and daily do perplex the Church. And here is still a remedy for all things. For if Private Respect[s], if || Bandies in a Faction, if power, and favour of some parties, if weakness of them which have the managing, if any unfit mixture of State-Councils, if any departure from the Rule of the Word of God, if any thing else sway and wrench the Council; the Whole * Church, upon evidence found in express Scripture, or demonstration of this miscarriage, hath power to represent her self in another Body, or Council, and to take order for what was amis, either practised, or concluded. So here is a means without any infringing any lawful Authority of the Church, to preserve, or reduce Unity, and yet grant, as I did, and as the + Church of England doth, That a General Council may err.

And this course the Church heretofore took; for she did call, and represent her self in a new Council, and define against the Heretical Conclusions of the former: as in the case at Ariminum, and the second of Ephesus, is evident: And in other Councils named by || Bellarmine. Now the Church is never more cunningly abused, than when men out of this Truth, that she may erre, infer this Falshood, that she is not to be Obeyed. For it will never follow, She may Erre, Therefore She may not Govern. For he that says, Obey them which have the Rule over

* Heb. 13. 17. you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your souls, * Heb. 13. commands Obedience, and expressly ascribes Rule to the Church.

And that is not onely a Pastoral Power, to teach and direct, but a Praetorian also, to Control and Censure too, where Errors or Crimes are against Points Fundamental, or of great Consequence. Else S. Paul would not have given the Rule for

1 Cor. 5. 5. Excommunication, 1 Cor. 5. Nor Christ himself have put the man that will not hear and obey the Church into the place and

3. Mat. 18. 17. condition of an Ethnick and a Publican, as he doth, S. Mat. 18.

And Solomon's Rule is general, and he hath it twice: My son, forsake not the teaching, or instruction of thy Mother. Now this

¶ Id. S. Aug. d. Conf. c. 3. and (Prov. 6. 20.) Eccl. 3. 3. Pro. 13. 20. be upon him, that despiseth her, Prov. 15. Or 'tis extended also to our Mystical and Spiritual Mother, the Church. And so the

Gene-

*Geneva** Note upon the Place expresses it. And I cannot but incline to this Opinion; Because the Blessings which accompany this Obedience are so many and great, as that they are not like to be the fruits of Obedience to a Natural Mother onely, as Solomon expresses them all, *Prov. 6.* And in all this, here's no Exception of *Prov. 6. 22.* of the Mothers erring. For *Mater errans*, an erring Mother loses neither the right nor the power of a Mother by her error. And I marvel what Son should shew reverence or obedience, if no Mother, that hath erred, might exact it. 'Tis true, the Son is not to follow his *Mother's error*, or his *Mother into errors*. But 'tis true too, 'tis a grievous crime in a Son to cast off all obedience to his Mother, because at some time, or in some things, she hath fallen into error. And howsoever, *this Consideration* meets with this Inconvenience, as well as the rest: For suppose (as I said) in the whole Catholike Militant Church, an absolute *Infallibility* in the Prime Foundations of Faith absolutely necessary to Salvation: And then, though the *Mother-Church*, Provincial, or National, may erre; yet if the *Grand-mother*, the whole Universal Church cannot in these necessary things, all remains safe, and all occasions of *Disobedience* taken from the possibility of the Churches erring, are quite taken away. Nor is this *Mother* less to be valued by her Children, because in some smaller things Age had filled her face fuller of wrinkles. For where 'tis said, that *Christ makes to himself a Church without spot or wrinkle*, *Eph. 5.* that is not understood of the *Church Militant*, but of the *Church Triumphant*. † And to maintain the contrary, is a Branch of the spreading Heresie of *Pelagianism*. Nor is the Church on earth any freer from wrinkles in *Doctrine*, and *Discipline*, than she is from spots in *Life* and *Conversation*.

The next thing I Consider, is: Suppose a General Council take N U M. 5. it self to be infallible in all things which are of Faith: If it prove not so, but that an Error in the Faith be concluded; the same Erring Opinion that makes it think it self Infalilble, makes the Error of it seem irrevocable. And when Truth, which lay hid, shall be brought to light, the *Church* (who was lulled asleep by the opinion of *Infallibility*) is left open to all manner of Distractions, as it appears at this day. And that a Council may erre, (besides all other Instances, which are not few) appears by that Error of the Council of Constance. And one Instance is enough to overthrow a General, be it a Council. * *Christ institut-
ed the Sacrament of his Body and Blood in both kindes.* To break Christ's Institution, is a Damnable Error, and so confessed by † *Stapleton*. The Council

* *Forlacke not thy Mother instruction*, that is, the Teaching of the Church, wherein the faithful are begotten by the incorruptible seed of God's Word.
Annot. in *Prov. 1.8.*

Ephes. 5. 27.

+ *In id progredivuntur (Pelagiani) ut dicunt vitam fujorum in voc seculo nullum omnino haberi peccatum, &c. his Ecclesi-
am Christi in hac mortalitate perfici, ut si omnia sine macula & ruga. Quasi
non sit Christi Ecclesia, qua in toto ter-
ram orbem clamat ad Deum: Dimitte
nobis debita nostra, &c. S. Ang. lde
Heresium, Her. 88.*

|| *Sess. 13.*

* *S. Matth. 26.
1 Cor. 11. 23.*

+ *Retorts of untruths upon Mr. Jewel.
Ar. 2. Untruth 49.*

is bold, and defines peremptorily, That to Communicate in both kindes, is not necessary, with a Non obstante to the Institution of Christ. Consider now with me, Is this an Error, or not? * Bellarmine, and Stapleton, and you too, say 'tis not; because to receive under both kindes, is not by Divine Right. No? No sure. For it was not Christ's Precept, but his Example. Why, but I had thought, Christ's Institution of a Sacrament had been more than his Example only, and as binding for the Necessaries of a

¶ And now lately in a Catechism Printed at Paris, 1639. without the Authors name, 'tis twice affirmed thus: The Institution of a Sacrament is of it self a Command. Conference 14, p. 244. And again, p. 269, Institution is a Precept.

* S. Matth. 26
1 Cor. 11.
Mysteries
of our
eucharist,
in Liturg. S. Chrys.

able) take the Precept with it, * Drink ye All of this; which though you shift as you can, yet you can never make it other than it is, A binding Precept. But Bellarmine hath yet one better Device than this, to save the Council. He saith, It is

That the Non obstante hath no reference to Receiving under both kindes, but to the time of receiving it, after Supper; in which the Council saith, the Custom of the Church is to be observed, Non obstante, notwithstanding Christ's Example.

How foul Bellarmine is in this, must appear by the words of the Council, which are these: † Though Christ instituted this venerable Sacrament, and gave it his Disciples after Supper under both kindes of Bread and Wine; yet, Non obstante, notwithstanding this, it ought not to be Consecrated after Supper, nor received but fasting. And likewise, that though in the Primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithful under both kindes; yet this Custom, that it should be received by Lay-men only under the kinde of Bread, is to be held for a Law, which may not be refused.

Custam of Receiving under one kinde, is erroneous; and they which persist in saying so, are to be punished, and driven out as Heretics. Now, where is here any slander of the Council? The words are plain, and the Non obstante must necessarily (for ought I can yet see) be referred to both Clauses in the words following, because both Clauses went before it, and hath as much force against Receiving under both kindes, as against Receiving after Supper. Yea, and the after-words of the Council couple both together, in this Reference: for it follows, Et similiter, and so likewise, that though in the Primitive Church, &c. And a man by the Definition of this Council, may be an Here-

Heretick, for standing to Christ's Institution, in the very matter of the Sacrament: And the Churches Law for *One kinde* may not be refused, but Christ's Institution under *Both kindes* may. And yet this Council did not erre; No; take heed of it.

But your Opinion is more *Unreasonable* than this; for consider any *Body Collective*, be it more, or less *Universal*, whensover it assembles it self, did it ever give more power to the *Representing Body*, of it, than binding power upon all particulars, and it self? And did it ever give this power otherwise, than with this *Reservation in Nature*? That it would call again and reform, yea, and if need were, abrogate any *Law*, or *Ordinance*, upon just cause made evident, that this *Representing Body*, had failed in Trust, or Truth? And this Power no *Body Collective*, Ecclesiastical or Civil, can put out of it self, or give away to a *Parliament*, or *Council*, or call it what you will, that represents it. Nay, in my *Consideration* it holds strongest in the Church. For a *Council* hath power to order, settle, and Define differences arisen concerning *Faith*. This Power the *Council* hath not by any immediate *Institution* from Christ, but it was prudently taken up in the *Church*, from the * *Apostles Example*. So that to hold Councils to this end, is apparent *Apostolical Tradition* written: but the Power, which Councils so held have, is from the whole Catholike Church, whose members they are, and the Churches power from God. And † this Power the *Church* cannot further give away to a General Council, than that the Decrees of it shall binde all Particulars, and it self, but not binde the whole Church from calling again; and in the After-calls, upon just Cause, to order, yea, and if need be, to abrogate former Acts. I say, upon just Cause. For if the Council be lawfully called, and proceed orderly, and conclude according to the Rule, the Scripture, the whole Church cannot but approve the Council, and then the Definitions of it, are Binding. And the Power of the Church hath no wrong in this, so long as no Power, but her own, may meddle, or offer to infringe any Definition of hers made in her Representative Body, a Lawful General Council. And certain it is, no Power, but her own may do it. Nor doth this open any gap to private Spirits. For all Decisions in such a Council, are Binding: And because the whole Church can meet no other way, the Council shall remain the Supreme, External, Living, Temporary, Ecclesiastical Judge of all Controversies. Only the Whole Church, and she alone hath power, when Scripture or Demonstration is found, and peaceably tended to her, to represent her self again in a new Council, and in it to order what was amiss.

* *Act. 15. In Novo Testamento Exemplum celebratiois Conciliorum ab Apostolis habemus, &c. Job. de Turre cremata Sum. de Eccles. Lib. 3. c. 2. Et firmitas Conciliorum videntur Exemplo primi Concilii. Stapl. Rileii. Cont. 6. q. 3. A. 4. ad 3.*

† *This is more reasonable a great deal than that of Bellarmine, 2. de Concil. c. 18. Pontificem non posse se subjecere sententiae coactioe Conciliorum.*

NUM. 7.

Nay, your Opinion is yet more unreasonable : For you do not only make the Definition of a General Council, but the Sentence of the Pope infallible, nay more Infallible than it. * For any General Council may erre with you, if the Pope confirm it not. So belike this Infallibility rests not in the Representative Body, the Council, nor in the Whole Body, the Church, but in your Head of the Church, the Pope of Rome. Now I may ask you, to what end such a trouble for a General Council ? Or wherein are we nearer to Unity, if the Pope confirm it not ? You answer, (though not in the Conference, yet elsewhere) That the Pope erreth not, especially giving Sentence in a General Council. And why especially ? Doth the Deliberation of a Council help any thing to the Conclusion ? Surely not in your Opinion : For you hold the Conclusion Propheticall, the means fallible : and fallible Deliberations cannot advance to a Prophetick Conclusion. And just as the Council is in Stapleton's Judgement,

* Canis lib. 6. de Loci, cap. 8. § Et quidem in Pontificis Summo in Conclusione errare nequent. Rationes autem, &c.

+ Relat. cap. 6. q. 3. Art. 5. & ibid. Quia ad compendias importans Hanc concilii Generalis Definitionis illustratio est, &c. Et unde tantum magis manifesti, &c.

¶ A. de Rom. Pont. c. 3. § At contra, Nam. Ex quo apparet tamen firmitudinem Conciliorum Legitimationem est a Pontifice, non partim a Pontifice, partim a Concilio.

for the Definition and the Proofs ; so is the Pope, in the Judgement of * Melch. Canis, and them which followed him, Propheticall in the Conclusion. The Council then is called but one-ly in effect to hear the Pope give his Sentence in more state. Else what means this of + Stapleton : The Pope by a Council joyned unto him, acquires no new Power, or Authority, or Certainty in Judging, no more than a Head is the wiser by joyning the Offices of the rest of the members to it, than it is without them ? Or this of || Bellarmine, That the firmness and infallibility of a General Council is onely from the Pope, not partly from the Pope, and partly from the Council ? So belike the Presence is

necessary, not the Assistance : Which opinion is the most groundless, and worthless, that ever offered to take possession of the Christian Church. And I am perswaded, many Learned men among your selves scorn it at the very heart. And I avow it, I have heard some Learned and Judicious Romane Catholikes utterly condemn it. And well they may. For no man can affirm it, but he shall make himself a scorn to all the Learned men of

* Et vivum est quod Adversarii non assertant cum Impeccabilitate Almain : Et credo firmis. And I verily believe they would be bold enough to affirm it, morum Pontificis did not the daily Works of the Popes compel them to believe the cum Opera ad credendum Opuspositum compilarent. Almain. de Author. Et sive. l. 10. fine.

lity, or other gross Impiety, if their own Historians be true. Take your choice of * John the thirteenth, about the year 966. "Platus & Cunaphorus in vita tornata." Or of Sylvester the second, about the year 999. Or John the eighteenth, about the year 1003. Or Benedict the ninth, about the year 1033. Or Boniface the eighth, about the year 1294. Or Alexander the sixth, about the year 1492. And yet these, and their like, must be Infallible in their *Dictates* and *Conclusions* of Faith. Do your own believe it? Surely no.

For [†]Alphonsus à Castro tells us plainly, That he doth not believe; that any man can be so gross and impudent a flatterer of the Pope, as to attri-
bute this unto him, that he can neither erre nor
mistake in expounding the holy Scripture. This
comes home; And therefore it may well be
thought it hath taken a shrewd Purge. For
these words are Express in the Edition at Paris, 1534. But they
are not to be found in that at Colen, 1539. Nor in that at Ant-
werp, 1556. Nor in that at Paris, 1571. || Harding says indeed,
^{II} Alphonsus left it out, of himself, in the following Editions.
Well: First, Harding says this, but proves it not; so I may
chuse whether I will believe him, or no. Secondly, be it so, that
he did; that cannot help their Cause a whit. For say he did
mislike the sharpnes of the Phrase, or ought else in this speech;
yet he alter'd not his Judgement of the thing. For in all these
Later Editions he speaks as home, if not more than in the first;
and says Expressly, * That the Pope may erre, not only as a pri-
vate person, but as Pope. And in difficult Cases he addes, That
the Pope ought to Consult Viros doctos, men of Learning. And
this also was the Opinion of the Ancient Chyreh of Christ con-
cerning the Pope and his Infallibility. For thus Liberius, and he
a Pope himself, writes to Athanasius: Brother Athanasius, if
you think in the presence of God, and Christ, as I do, I pray sub-
scribe this Confession, which is thought to be the true Faith of the
Holy, Catbolike, and Apostolike Church, that we may be the more
certain, that you think concerning the Faith, as We do. † Ut ego + <sup>* Calistinus ex-
eravit non solum ut privata per-
sona, sed ut Pa-
pa, &c. Alph.
à Castro, L. 1.
Ibid. Hard. c. 4.</sup>
etiam persuasus sum inhaesitancie, That I also may be persuaded
without all doubting of those things which you shall be pleased
to Command me. Now I would fain know, if the Pope at that
time were, or did think himself Infallible, how he should possi-
bly be more certainly persuaded of any Truth belonging to the
Faith by Athanasius his concurring in Judgement with him. For nothing can make Infallibility more certain than it is: At least, not the concurring judgement of that is Fallible, as S.
Athanasius was. Beside, the Pope Complemented exceeding low, that would submit his unerring Judgement to be commanded by
Athanasius, who, he well knew, could Erre. Again, in the
Case of Easter, (which made too great a noise in the Church of
old)

* Post agitatem ipsa-
tum ex Alexandria Ecclie
se definitionem. Doicione
queque Romane Ecclesie per
Literas plenis, meam adi-
expectant sententiam, quid
exstinxim de dicto Pastore. S.
Ambr. L. 10. Epis. 83.

+ Ex hoc parte quod Ecclie
non confitit in hominibus
ratione Potestatis vel Digni-
tatis Ecclesiasticae vel Secu-
laris, quid multi Precep-
tes & Summi Pontifices
Alii oratione invenerunt
Apostoli a Fide, C. 16.
Lyra in S. Matth. 16. 18.

old) * Very many men called for S. Ambrose his Judge-
ment in that Point, even after the Definition of the
Church of Alexandria, and the Bishop of Rome. And
this I presume they would not have done, had they
then conceived either the Pope, or his Church infalli-
ble. And thus it continued down to Lyra's time:

For he says exprely, + That many Popes as well as o-

ther Inferiors, have not onely erred, but even quite A-

postatis from the Faith. And yet now nothing but

Infallibility will serve their turns. And sometimes

they have not onely taken upon them to be Infallible

in Cathedra, in their Chair of Decision, but also to

Propheticall Infallible out of the Scripture. But Pro-

pheticall Scripture (such as the Revelation is) was too danger-

ous for men to meddle with, which would be careful of their

Credit in not Erring. For it fell out in the time of Innocent

|| Rom. Pontifices ex Historia, &c. the third, and Honorius the the third (as || A-

mandacione est exitus probavit. A-

ventinus, Annal. Bosorum, L. 7. p. 529,

Edit. Basili. 1586.

Baron. Ab.

1179. N. 13.

which happened anno 1179. For then in a Council held at
Rome, Pope Alexander the third Condemned Peter Lombard of
Heresy. And he lay under that Damnation for thirty and six
years, till Innocent the third restored him, and condemned his
Accusers. Now Peter Lombard was then condemned for some-
thing which he had written about the humane Nature of our
Saviour Christ. So here was a great Mystery of the Faith in
hand; something about the Incarnation. And the Pope was in
Cathedral, and that in a Council of three hundred Archbishops
and Bishops. And in this Council he condemned Peter Lombard,
and, in him, his Opinion about the Incarnation. And therefore of
necessity either Pope Alexander erred, and that in Cathedra, as
Pope, in Condemning him; or Pope Innocentius, in restoring
him. The truth is, Pope Alexander had more of Alexander the
Great, than of S. Peter in him. And being accustomed to War-
like Employments, he understood not that which Peter Lombard
had written about this Mystery. And so He, and his Learned As-
sistants condemned him unjustly.

And whereas you profess * after, That you hold nothing against
your Conscience; I must ever wonder much, how that can be
true, since you hold this of the Pope's Infallibility, especially as
being Propheticall in the Conclusion. If this be true, why do
you not lay all your strength together, all of your whole So-
ciety, and make this one Proposition evident? For all Contro-
versies about matters of Faith are ended, and without any
great trouble to the Christian World, if you can but make this
one

NUM. 8.

* Apud A.C.

p. 68.

one Proposition good, *That the Pope is an Infallible Judge*. Till then, this shame will follow you infallibly, and eternally, That you should make the Pope, a meer man, *Principium Fidei*, a Principle, or Author of Faith; and make the mouth of him, whom you call *Christ's Vicar*, sole Judge, both of *Christ's Word*, be it never so manifest, and of his Church, be she never so Learned, and careful of his Truth. And for Conclusion of this Point, I would fain know (since this had been so plain, so easie a way, either to prevent all Divisions about the Faith, or to end all Controversies, did they arise) why this brief, but most necessary Proposition, *The Bishop of Rome cannot erre in his Judicial Determinations concerning the Faith*, is not to be found either in letter or sense, in any Scripture, in any Council, or in any Father of the Church, for the full space of a thousand years and more after Christ? For had this Proposition been true, and then received in the Church, how weak were all the Primitive Fathers, to prescribe so many Rules and Cautions for avoidance of Heresie, as *Tertullian*, and *Vincentius Lirinensis*, and others do, and to endure such hard Conflicts, as they did, and with so many various Hereticks; To see Christendom so rent, and torn by some distempered Councils, as that of *Animum*, the second of *Ephesus*, and others; Nay, to see the whole world almost become Arrian, to the amazement of it self; And yet all this time not so much as call in this Necessary Assistance of the Pope, and let the world know, *That the Bishop of Rome was infallible*; that so in his Decision all Differences might cease? For either the Fathers of the Church, Greek as well as Latine, knew this Proposition to be true, *That the Pope cannot Err judicially in matters belonging to the Faith*, or they knew it not. If you say they knew it not; you charge them with a base, and unworthy Ignorance, no ways like to over-cloud such, and so many Learned men, in a Matter so Necessary, and of such infinite use to Christendom. If you say they knew it, and durst not deliver this Truth; how can you charge them, which durst die for Christ, with such Cowardise towards his Church? And if you say they knew it, and with-held it from the Church; you lay a most unjust Load upon those Charitable souls, which loved Christ too well to imprison any Truth, but likely to make or keep peace in his Church Catholike over the world. But certainly, as no Divine of Worth did then dream of any such Infallibility in Him; so is it a meer Dream, or worse, of those Modern Diviners, who affirm it now*: And as † S. Augustine sometimes spake of the Donatists, and their absurd limiting the whole Christi-

* *The wilde Least of the Popes Infallibility and Jurisdiction is a Mistery*. These are the words of a Great Roman Catholique uttered to my self. But I will spare his Name, because he is living; and I will not draw your Blasie upon him.
† *Ruto quod iustitiam rideant, quoniam hoc audirent, tamen nisi hoc dicant, quod erubescant si dicant, non habent omnino quod dicant. Sed quid ad nos? Nonne incidentur? Tamen quod non dicant?*

an Church to Africa onely ; so may I truely say of the Romaniſt confining all Christianity to the Romane Doctrine, governed by the Pope's Infallibility : I verily perſwade my ſelf, That even the Jeſuites themſelves laugh at this. And yet unleſs they ſay this, which they cannot but bluſh while they ſay, they have nothing at all to ſay. But what's this to us ? we envie no man. If the Pope's Decision be infallible, Legant, Let them read it to us out of the Holy Scripture, and we'll believe it.

NUM. 9.

In the mean time, take this with you, That moſt certain it is, That the Pope hath no Infallibility to attend his Cathedral Judgement in things belonging to the Faith. For firſt, beſides

* Papa non ſolum Error per-
ſonali, ſed & deſeſſit it, yea and prove it too, by ſundry Instances.

Erroris Judiciali potest errare in Matrib Fidei. Almain. L. de Author. Eccles. c. 10.

NUM. 10.

Secondly, There is a great Quelction among the Learned, both School-men and Controversiers, Whether the Pope coming to be an Heretick, may be Depoſed ? And tis Learnedly diſputed by † L. 2. de Rom. Pont. c. 30. † Si fit à Fide Bellarmine. The Opinions are diſſerent. For the Canon-Law devins. Diſſ. 40. Can. Si Papa. says expreſſly, He may be judged and depoſed by the Church in * Jure Divino case of Heretice. * Joh. de Turrecremata is of Opinion, That Peccatum priuatum illi, &c. Jo. de Turrect. l. 4. an Heretick, though as yet not a maniſt one ; Because he is Par. 2. c. 20. Et already deprived by Divine Right. And recites another opinion Bellar. L. 2. de Rom. Pont. c. 30. § Et ro. Pont. c. 30. on, That the Pope cannot be depoſed, thōgh he fall into ſecret or maniſt Heretice. † Cajetan thinks that the Pope cannot be depoſed, but for a maniſt Heretice, and that then he is not depoſed ipſo facto,

¶ Papa Hereticus maniſtus per Ipſo factum ipſe Papa & Capit. Et tam patet ab Ecclesiſa Judicari, & puniri. Bellar. L. 2. de Rom. Pont. c. 30. § Et ergo quinta.

then be Judged and puniſhed by the Church. Bellarmine hath diſputed this very Learnedly, and at large ; and I will not fill this Discouerſe with another mans Labours. The uſe I ſhall make of it, runs through all theſe Opinions, and through all alike. And truly the very Question it ſelf ſuppoſes, that A Pope may be an Heretick. For if he cannot be an Heretick, why do they queſtion, whether he can be Depoſed for being one ? And if he can be one, then whether he can be Depoſed by the Church, Before he be maniſt, or not till after, or neither before nor after, or which way they will, it comes all to one for my purpoſe. For I queſtion not here his Depoſition for his Heretice, but his Heretice. And I hope none of theſe Learned men, nor any other, dare deny, but that if the Pope can be an Heretick, he can erre. For every Heretice is an Errour, and more. For tis an Errour oft-times againſt the Errants knowledge, but ever with the pertinacie of his Will. Therefore out of all, even your own Grounds;

Grounds ; If the Pope can be an Heretick, he can erre grossly, he can erre wilfully. And he that can so Err, cannot be *Infallible* in his Judgement private or publike. For if he can be an Heretick, he can, and doubtless will Judge for his Heresie, if the Church let him alone. And you your selves maintain his *Doperation* lawful, to prevent this. I verily believe * Alb. Pighius foresaw this Blow : And therefore he is of Opinion, That the Pope cannot become an Heretick at all. And though + Bellar- mine favour him so far, as to say his Opinion is probable ; yet he is so honest as to adde, that the Common opinion of Divines sumus negare, is against him. Nay, though || he Labour hard to excuse Pope Honorius the first from the Heresie of the Monothelites, and says, that Pope Adrian was deceived, who thought him one, yet * He confesses, That Pope Adrian the second, with the Council then held at Rome, and the eighth General Synod, did think that the Pope might be Judged in the Cause of Heresie : And that the condition of the Church were most miserable, if it should be constrained to acknowledge a Wolf manifestly raging for her Shepherd. And here again I have a Question to ask, Whether you believe the eighth General Council, or not ? If you believe it, then you see the Pope can erre, and so He not *Infallible*. If you believe it not, then in your Judgement that General Council erres, and so that not *Infallible*.

Thirdly, It is altogether in vain, and to no use, that the Pope should be *Infallible*, and that according to your own Principles. Now God and Nature make nothing in vain. Therefore either the Pope is not *Infallible*, or at least God never made him so. That the *Infallibility* of the Pope (had he any in him) is altogether vain, and useless, is manifest. For if it be of any use, 'tis for the settling of Truth and Peace in the Church, in all times of her Distraction. But neither the Church, nor any member of it, can make any use of the Popes *Infallibility* that way ; Therefore it is of no use or benefit at all. And this also is as manifest, as the rest. For before the Church, or any particular man, can make any use of this *Infallibility*, to settle him and his Conscience, he must either Know or Believe that the Pope is *Infallible* : But a man can neither Know nor Believe it. And first for Belief. For if the Church, or any Christian man can believe it, he must believe it either by Divine, or by Humane Faith. Divine Faith cannot be had of it : For (as is before proved) it hath no Ground in the written Word of God. Nay (to follow you closer) it was never delivered by any Tradition of the Catholike Church. And for Humane Faith, no Rational man can possibly believe (having no Word of God to over-rule his Understanding) that he which is Fallible in the Means, as * your selves confess the Pope is, can possibly be *Infallible* in the Conclusion. And were it so, that a Rational man could have Humane Faith of this *Infallibility* ;

* Pighius L.4.

Ecclesiastice

Hierarchie, &c.

† Communis O-

pinio est in con-

trarium. Bell.

L. 2. de Rom.

Pont. c. 30. S. 2.

|| Lib. 4. de Rom.

Pont. cap. 11.

* Tam non pos-

sumus negare,

quis Adrianus

cum Romano

Concilium o-

tota Synodus o-

clava Genera-

lis erit, in

causa Heresie

posse Rom. Pon-

t. c. 30. S. 3.

cari. Adde quod

est eff. miseranda

conditio Eccl-

sie, si lupum ma-

nifeste graffan-

tem pro Papere

agnoscere coep-

rept. Bel. L. 2.

de Ro. Pont. c.

30. S. 3.

Num. II.

admodum

yet that neither is, nor never can be sufficient to make the *Pope Infallible*. No more than my strong Belief of another mans Honesty can make him an Honest man, if he be not so. Now secondly, for Knowledge; and that is altogether impossible too, that either the Church, or any Member of the Church, should ever know that the *Pope is Infallible*. And this I shall make evident also out of your own *Principles*. For your * Council of Florence had told us, That three things are necessary to every Sacrament; the Matter, the Form of the Sacrament, and the Intention of the Priest, which administers it, that he intends to do as the Church doth. Your † Council of Trent confirms it for the Intention of the Priest. Upon this Ground (be it Rock or Sand, it is all one; for you make it Rock, and build upon it) I shall raise this Battery against the *Pope's Infallibility*. First, the Pope if he have any *Infallibility* at all, he hath it as he is *Bishop of Rome*, and *S. Peter's Successor*. || This is granted. Secondly, the *Pope* cannot be *Bishop of Rome*, but he must be in *Holy Orders* first. And if any man be chosen that is not so, the *Election* is void *ipso facto*, propter errorum Personae, for the error of the Person. * This also is granted. Thirdly, He that is to be made *Pope*, can never be in *Holy Orders*, but by receiving them from One that hath *Power to Ordain*. This is notoriously known; So is it also, that with you *Order is a Sacrament* properly so called. And if so, then the *Pope*, when he did receive the *Order of Deacon, or Priesthood* at the hands of the *Bishop*, did also receive a *Sacrament*. Upon these Grounds I raise my Argument thus. Neither the Church, nor any Member of the Church, can know that this *Pope* which now sits, or any other that hath been, or shall be, is *Infallible*. For he is not *Infallible*, unless he be *Pope*; and he is not *Pope*, unless he be in *Holy Orders*; And he cannot be so, unless he have received those *Holy Orders*, and that from one that had *Power to Ordain*; And those *Holy Orders* in your Doctrine are a *Sacrament*; And a *Sacrament* is not perfectly given, if he that Administers it have not *intentionem faciens quod facit Ecclesie*, an intention to do that which the Church doth by *Sacraments*. Now who can possibly tell, that the *Bishop* which gave the *Pope* Orders, was first, a man qualified to give them; and secondly, so devoutly set upon his Work, that he had, at the instant of giving them, an *Intention* and purpose to do therein as the Church doth? Surely none but that *Bishop* himself. And his testimony of himself, and his own Act, such especially as, if faulty, he would be loth to Confess, can neither give *Knowledge* nor *Belief* sufficient, that the *Pope*, according to this *Canon*, is in *Holy Orders*. So upon the Whole matter, let the *Romanists* take which they will (I will give them free Choice), either this *Canon of the Council of Trent* is false Divinity, and there is no such *Intention necessary to the Essence and Being of a Sacrament*;

Or

Or if it be true, it is impossible for any man to know, and for any advised man to Believe, *That the Pope is Infallible in his Judicial Sentences in things belonging to the Faith.* And so here again a *General Council*, at least such a one, as that of *Trent* is, can Erre, or the *Pope* is not Infallible.

But this is an Argument *ad Hominem*, good against your Party onely, which maintain *this Council*. But the plain Truth is, *Both are Errors.* For neither is the *Bishop of Rome* Infallible in his *Judicials* about the *Faith*: Nor is this *Intention* of either *Bishop* or *Priest* of Absolute Necessity to the *Essence* of a *Sacrament*; so, as to make void the gracious Institution of Christ, in case by any Tentation the *Priests* Thoughts should wander from his Work, at the *instant* of using the *Essentials* of a *Sacrament*, or have in him an Actual Intention to scorn the Church. And you may remember, if you please, that a Neapolitan * *Bishop* * *Minorenus Episcopus fuit.* then present at *Trent*, disputed this *Case* very Learnedly, and made it most evident that this *Opinion* cannot be defended, but that it must open a way for any unworthy Priest to make infinite *Nullities* in Administration of the *Sacraments*. And his Arguments were of such strength, + *ut ceteros Theologos dede-* + *L.2. Hib. Tri-*
rint in stuporem; as amazed the other Divines which were pre-*dent. p. 276,*
sent. And concluded, *That no Internal Intention was required* 277. *Lide,*
in the Minister of a Sacrament, but that Intention which did ap-
pear Opere externo; in the Work it self performed by him: And
that if he had unworthily any mandring thoughts, nay more, any
contrary Intention within him, yet it neither did, nor could hind-
er the blessed effect of any Sacrament. And most certain it is, if this be not true, besides all other Inconveniences, which are many, no man can secure himself upon any Doubt or trouble in his Conscience, that he hath truly and really been made partaker of any Sacrament whatsoever, No, not of Baptism; and so by Consequence be left in doubt whether he be a Christian or no, even after he is Baptized. Whereas 'tis most impossible, That Christ should so order his *Sacraments*, and so leave them to his Church, as that poor Believers in his Name, by any unworthiness of any of his *Priests*, should not be able to know whether they have received His *Sacraments* or not, even while they have received them. And yet for all this, such great lovers of Truth, and such careful Pastors over the *Flock of Christ*, were these *Trent-Fathers*, that they regarded none of this, but went on in the usual track, and made their Decree for the *Internal Inten-*
tion and purpose of the Priest, and that the Sacrament was in-
valid without it.

Nay, one Argument more there is, and from your own Grounds *NUM. 13.* too, that makes it more than manifest, *That the Pope can erre, not personally onely; but judicially also;* and so teach false Doctrine

* *Summis donis* quidam totam Ecclesiam docet, in his que ad Fidem pertinet, nullus oculu errare potest. Bellar. L. 4. de Röm. Pont. c. 3. § 1.

† *Councilia Generalia à Pontifice Confirmata errare non possunt*. Bellar. L. 2. de Concil. c. 2. § 1.

to the Church ; which * Bellarmine tells us *No Pope hath done, or can do*. And a *Maxime* it is with you, *That a General Council can err, if it be confirmed by the Pope* ; † *But if it be confirmed, then it cannot erre*. Where first, this is very improper Language. For I hope no Council is confirmed, till it be finished. And when 'tis finished, even before the *Popes confirmation* be put to it, either it hath Erred, or not Erred. If it have Erred, the *Pope* ought not to confirm it ; and if he do, 'tis a void act. For no power can make Falshood Truth. If it have not Erred, then it was True before the *Pope confirmed* it. So his *Confirmation* addes nothing but his own *Assent* : Therefore his *confirmation* of a *General Council* (as you will needs call it) is at the most *Signum, non Causa* ; a *Signe*, and that such as may fail, but no *Cause* of the *Councils* not Erring. But then secondly, if a *General Council Confirmed* (as you would have it) by the *Pope* have Erred, and so can Erre ; then certainly the *Pope* can Erre *Judicially*. For he never gives a more solemn Sentence for Truth, than when he decrees any thing in a *General Council*. Therefore if he have Erred, and can Erre there, then certainly he can Erre in his *Definitive Sentence* about the Faith, and is not *Infallible*. Now that he hath Erred, and therefore can Erre in a *General Council confirmed*, in which he takes upon him to teach all *Christendom*, is most clear and evident. For

¶ *Council. Lateran.* Cas. 1.

* *Council. Conf. Sess. 13.*

¶ *Council. Trid. Sess. 25. Decret. de Invocatione.* And in and by the * *Council of Constance*, the Administration of the Blessed Sacrament to the Laity in one kind, notwithstanding Christ's Institution of it in both kindes for all. And in and by the † *Council of Trent*, *Invocation of Saints, and Adoration of Images*, to the great Scandal of Christianity, and as great hazard of the Weak. Now that these Particulars, among Many, are Errors in Divinity, and about the Faith, is manifest both by *Scripture*, & the *Judgement of the Primitive Church*. For *Transubstantiation* first ; That never was heard of in the *Primitive Church*, not till the *Council of Lateran* ; nor can it be proved out of *Scripture* ; and taken properly, cannot stand with the Grounds of Christian Religion. As for *Communion in one kind* ; *Christ's Institution* is clear against that. And not onely the *Primitive Church*, but the *Whole Church of Christ* kept it so, till

¶ *Provide in quibusdam Ecclesiis obseruatorum, ut Populus Sanguis non desinat.* Thom. p. 3. q. 80. A. 12. c. So it was but in some Churches in his time. *Magis non possumus quam in Ecclesiis Latini fuisse ipsum utriusque speciei, & ualeat ad Tempora S. Iustinae diffusa.* Valq. in Disput. 216. c. 2. n. 38.

* *Refecti cibo primiti, calibbi, Deus uult, te supplices extorantis, &c. In proprio Missarum de Sanctis, Tertii. c. 5. Oratio post Communionem. Et Jan. 41.*

¶ *Aquinas confesses it was so in use even to his times* ; And he was both born & dead during the Reign of Henry the third of England. Nay, it stands yet as a Monument in the very * *Missal*, against the present Practice of the *Church of Rome*, That then it was usually Given and received in both kinder. And for *Invocation of Saints*, though some of the *Ancient Fathers* have some Rhetorical

cal

cal flourishes about it, for the stirring up of Devotion (as they thought) yet the Church then admitted not of the Innovation of them, but onely of the Commemoration of the Martyrs, as appears

clearly in *S. Augustine. And when the Church prayed to God for any thing, she desired to be heard for the Mercies and the Merits of Christ,

* Ad quod Sacrificium suo loco & ordine
Homini Dni nominantur, non tamen a
Saeculo, qas sanctissim, Invocantur.
S. Aug. L. 22. Ep. 10. 6. 10.

not for the Merits of any Saints whatsoever. For I much doubt

this were to make the Saints more than Mediators of Intercession;

which is all that + you acknowledge you allow the Saints. For + Bellarm. L. 1.
I pray, is not by the Merits, more than by the Intercession?

Did de Sanctor. Bala-
titud. c. 20.

not Christ redeem us by his Merits? And if God must hear our

Prayers for the Merits of the Saints, how much fall they short of

sharers in the || Mediation of Redemption?

ergo locti, &c.

You may think of this. For such Prayers as

these the Church of Rome makes at this day, and

they stand (not without great scandal to Christ,

and Christianity) used, and authorized to be u-

sed in the Missal. For instance: * Upon the

Feast of S. Nicolas you pray, That God by the

Merits and Prayers of S. Nicolas, would deliver

you from the fire of Hell. And upon the Octaves

of S. Peter and S. Paul, + you desire God that

you may Obtain the Glory of Eternity by their

Merits. And on the || Feast of S. Bonaventure

you pray, that God would absolve you from all

your sins by the Interceding Merits of Bonaven-

ture. And for Adoration of Images, the *Anci-

ent Church knew it not. And the Modern Church

of Rome is too like to Paganism in the Practice

of it; and driven to scarce Intelligible Subtilties

in her Servants Writings that defend it; And

this without any Care had of Millions of Souls

unable to understand her Subtilties, or shun her Practice. Did

I say, the Modern Church of Rome is grown too like Paganism in

this Point? And may this speech seem too hard? Well, if it do,

I'll give a double Account of it. The One is: Tis no harsher

Expression than They of Rome use of the Protestants, and in Cases

in which there is no shew or resemblance. For + Beccan. tells us,

+ Sicut nos li-
cet cum Eshu-
ciis Idola colere.

receive it, than to worship Idols with the Ethnicks. And Gregory de

Beccan. L. 4.
fide Heret. fer-
vanda, i. 8.

Valentia enlarges it to more Points than one, but with no more

truth. The Sectaries of our times || (faith he)

seem to Erre culpably in more things than the

Gentiles. This is easily said, but here's no Proof.

Nor shall I hold it a sufficient warrant for me to

swore my Language, because these men have

dipped their Pens in Gall. The Other Account

|| comingus aliquando hereticos circa

plana erare agam Gentiles, et Maniche-
os, inquit Thomas. Quid nos possumus

vere dicere de nobis superius Sectariis,
qui culpabiliter in pluribus videtur tr-
actari. Valentia is 2.2. Disp. 1. Q. 10.
Punkt. 3.

there.

therefore which I shall give of this speech, shall come vouch'd both by Authority and Reason. And first for Authority; I could set *Ludovicus Vives* against *Becanus*, if I would, who says expressly, That the making of Feasts at the Oratories of the Martyrs (which *S. Augustine tells us, The best Christians practised not) are a kinde of † Parentalia, Funeral-feasts too much resembling the superstition of the Gentiles. Nay, *Vives* need not say,

* Quid quidam à Christianis miseribus non sit. &c. Lib. L. B. de Civ. Dei, c. 27.
+ illa quae Parentalia a superstitione Gentilium simillima. Ibid. *Vives* Ibid.

|| Quid ergo mactu libabatur, unique Parentaliam deputabatur, que species proinde Idolatrie est, quoniam & Ido-
latria Parentaliam est species. Tert.
L. de Spectaculis, c. 12.

testimony against you, than *Becanus*, or *Valentia*, being bitter enemies to our Communion, can be against us. But I'll come nearer home to you, and prove it by more of your own. For

* Manifestum est, quin ut multis verbis explicari debet, imagines & simulachra Culturum nemini invulnere, & affidere, seu potius superstitione populi plus sat' induluum est, ita ut ad summam adoracionem, que vel à Paganis suis simulachris exhibens confucuit, &c. *Cassandra*. Consult. Art. 21. C. de Imaginibus. Where he names divers of your own, as namely, *Durantus Minervensis Episcopus*, *John Billit*, *Gerson*, *Durand*, *Holken*, and *Biel*, reflecting the Opinion of *Thomas*, and other superstitions concerning Images. *Ibid.*

+ Non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis Divinitas, & veluti olim fiebat à Gentibus. Conf. Ibid. Sess. 25. *Decret. de Invocat.*

|| Et radibus periculosis Erroris Occasionem, &c. Ibid.

Unlearned, to the *Scandal of Religion*, and the perverting of *Truth*. For the *Unlearned* first, how it works upon them by whole Countries together, you may see by what happened in *Asturias*, *Cantabria*, *Galicia*, no small parts of *Spain*. For there

* Et adh. Gen. affecta est trans-
the People (so *He tells me that was an Eye-witness, and that since
deformis-
formed Images; that when the Bishops commanded new, and hand-
vibus, ut me somer Images to be set up in their rooms, the poor people cried for
testo, quodres E-
their old, would not look up to their new, as if they did not re-
presenterem in present the same thing. And though he say, this is by little and
little amended, yet I believe there's very little Amendment.
plorantes, &c. And it works upon the *Learned* too, more than it should. For
Hieron. *Lamas* it wrought so far upon *Lamas* himself, who bemoaned the former
Summa p. 3. n. 2. *Imagines* - Passage, as that he delivers this Doctrine: + That the Images of
Hs & S. Maria Christ, the blessed Virgin, and the Saints, are not to be worshipped,
S. & Santos. as if there were any Divinity in the Images, as they are material
veranda, ac si in ipsis Imaginibus esset Divinitas, secundum quod sunt Materia Arte effigiat, & non secundum quod
representant Christum, & Santos, &c. Sic enim adorare, vel petere aliquid ab iis, esset Idolatria. *Lam. Ibid.*

things

things made by Art, but onely as they represent Christ and the Saints: for else it were Idolatry. So then belike according to the Divinity of this Casuist, a man may worship Images, and ask of them, and put his trust in them, as they represent Christ and the Saints. For so there is *Divinity* in them, though not as *Things*, yet as *Representers*. And what I pray did, or could any Pagan Priest say more than this? For the Proposition resolved is this: *The Images of Christ and the Saints, as they represent their Exemplars, have Deity or Divinity in them.* And now I pray A.C. do you be judge, whether this Proposition do not teach *Idolatry*? And whether the Modern Church of Rome be not grown too like to *Paganism* in this Point? For my own part, I heartily wish it were not. And that men of Learning would not strain their wits to spoil the *Truth*, and rent the *Peace* of the Church of Christ, by such dangerous, such superstitious vanities. For better they are not; but they may be worse. Nay, these and their like have given so great a *Scandal* among us, to some ignorant, though, I presume, well-meaning men, that they are afraid to testify their *duty to God*, even in his own House, by any outward Gesture at all. Insomuch that those very Ceremonies, which, by the Judgement of Godly and Learned men, have now long continued in the Practice of this Church, suffer hard measure for the Romish Superstitions sake. But I will conclude this Point with the saying of B. Rhenanus: Who could endure the people (says he) rushing into the Church like Swine into a sty? Doubtless, Ceremonies do not hurt the people, but profit them; so there be a Mean kept, and the Eye be not put for the Main, that is to say, so we place not the principal part of our Piety in them.

The Conference grows to an end, and I must meet it again ere we part. For you say,

F. After this (we all rising) the Lady asked the B. whether she might be saved in the Roman Faith? He answered, She might.

B. What? not one * Answer perfectly related? My Answer to this was General, for the ignorant, that could not discern the Errors of that Church; so they held the Foundation, and conformed themselves to a religious life. But why do you not speak out what I added in this Particular? That it must needs go harder with the Lady, even in point of Salvation, because she had been brought to understand very much, for one of her Condition, in these Controverted causes of Religion, And a person that comes to know much, had need carefully bethink himself, that he oppose not known Truth against the Church that made him a Christian. For Salvation may be in the Church of Rome, and yet they not finde it, that make surest of it. Here A.C. is as confident as the Jesuite himself, That I said expressly, That the Lady might be saved in the Roman Faith. Truly, tis too long since now for me to speak any more than I have already, upon my Memory: But this I am sure of, That whatsoeuer Maid of her, were it never so particular, yet was it under the Conditions before expressed.

F. I had her mark that.

§. 39. B. This Answer (I am sure) troubles not you. But it seems
NUM. 1. you would fain have it lay a load of envy upon me, that you
profess you bad the Lady so carefully, *mark that*. Well, you
bad her *Mark that*. For what? For some great matter? or for
some new? Not for some New sure. For the *Protestants* have
ever been ready for *Truth* and in *Charity* to grant as much as

* Nos fatemur sub Papatu plenum esse boni,
in' omne bona Christianorum, auge etiam illuc
ad nos devenerunt. dicitur. *De Notis Eccles.*
citante Bellarmino. L. 4. de Notis Eccles. c. 16.
§. penult. Et Field. *Apparatus*. par. 3. c. 2. Et
Jof. Hall Bishop of Exeter. L. Of the Old Re-
ligion. c. 1. Many holding Christ the Foun-
dation aright, and groaning under the burden
of Popish trah, &c. by a general repentance,
and assured Faith in their Saviour, did finde
favour with the Lord. Dr. Geo. Abbot late Archi-
bishop of Can. Answer to Hill. ad Ration.
1. 5. 30.

For my part I dare not deny the possibility of their Salvation, who have been the chiefest Instruments of ours, &c. *Hooke* in his Discourse of Japheth. §. 17. In former times a man might hold the general Doctrine of those Churches, wherein our Fathers lived, and be saved. And yet since the Council of Trent some are found in it in such degree of Orthodoxy, as we may well hope of their Salvation. *Field*. b. 2. Ecl. 6. 47.

The Latine, or Western Church subject to the Romish Tyranny, was a true Church, in which a saving profession of the Truth of Christ was found. *See Hall Bishop of Exeter. L. Of the Old Religion, first.* in his Advertisement to the Reader, p. 202.

*Non pauci retinuerunt Christianum Fundamentum, &c.
Mornzus Tract. de Ecclesiâ c. 9. finit.
Inter sordes istius, ista quo summa cum periculo ex-
peditat salutem, non solum addatam, sed ita,
que nobiscum habent compunctionem. Fundamentis est
attribuenda. Jo. Pridaeus Lisione 9. finit.
Papa aliquibus ad eum Religions formam relinquit,
quam vita eterna non habet, dicit. Calv. Institut.
advers. Libertinos, c. 4.*

+ Here A. C. gets another snatch, and tells us, That to grant a Possibility of Salvation in the Romane Church, is the free Confession of an Adversary, and therefore is of force against us, and extorted by Truth : But to say that Salvation is more securely, and easily to be had in the Protestant Faith, that's but their partial Opinion in their own behalf, and of no force, especially with Romane-Catholiques. I the rest use the matter with their Prophets, shewing will behave them, that it be of Force. Ego to Salvation, and he shall finde this no partial protestant living according to his belief, is upon them enforce it as far as they can against me, and his fellowz will (of all the rest) have but

L. 1. De Baga, cito. Dilectio. 3. Gratitudo peccantum in rebus ad salutem anime pertinetib[us], &c. et sibi quid certe incerta proponuntur.

might be. And therefore from the beginning many * Learned men granted this. So that you needed not have put such a serious *Mark that* upon my speech, as if none before had, or none but I would speak it. And if your *Mark that* were not for some New matter, was it for some Great ? Yes sure, it was. For what greater then Salvation ? But then I pray, *mark* this too, That might be saved, grants but a † Possibility, no sure, or safe way to Salvation. The Possibility I think cannot be denied, the Ignorants especially, because they hold the Foundation, and cannot survey the Building. And the Foun-

dation can deceive no man that rests upon it. But a *secure way* they cannot go, that hold with such *corruptions*, when they *know* them. Now whether it be *wisdom*, in such a Point as *Salvation* is, to forsake a *Church*, in the which the *Ground of Salvation* is *firm*, to follow a *Church*, *in which it is but possible one may be saved*, but very probable he may do worse, if he look not well to the *Foundation*, judge ye. I am sure || S. *Augustine* thought it was not, and judged it a *great sin*, in *Point of Salvation*, for a man to prefer *incerta certis uncertainties and naked possibi-*

eadily believe this latter part, That this, as A. C. and
l be of little, or no force with *Romane Catholicks*. But
let any indifferent man weigh the *Necessary Requirements*
Opinion, but very plain and real Verity, That the Pro-
fessor of *Methodism* has the *shortest* and *safest* way to Heaven. And as for my Confession, let
they observe my Limitations; which if they do, will
be comfort in such a limited Possibility.

ties before an evident and certain Course. And * Bellarmine Proper in-
is of opinion, and that in the Point of *Justification*: That in *propria Iusti-*
regard of the uncertainty of our own Righteousness, and of the tie, & pericu-
danger of vain glory, tutissimum est, tis safest to repose our sum ius in glo-
whole trust in the Mercy and goodness of God. And surely, if est fiducia
there be One safer way than another, as he confesses there is, *totam in sola*
he is no wise man, that in a matter of so great moment will not dñe & benig-
betake himself to the safest way. And therefore even you your *utate reponere.*
selves in the Point of *Condignity of Merit*, though you write *Bellar. L. 5.*
it, and preach it boisterously to the People; yet you are con-*de Jussif. c. 7.*
tent to die, renouncing the condignity of all your own *Merits*,
and trust to *Christ*. Now surely, if you will not venture to
die as you live, live and believe in time, as you mean to
die.

And one thing more, because you bid *Mark this*, let me re- N U M. 2.
member to tell you for the benefit of others. Upon this very
Point (*That we acknowledge an honest ignorant Papist may be*
saved) you and your like work upon the advantage of our *Chz-*
ritie, and your own want of it, to abuse the weak. For thus,
I am told you work upon them. You see the Protestants (at
least many of them) confess there may be *salvation in our*
Church; We absolutely deny there is *salvation in theirs*: There-
fore it is safer to come to Ours, than to stay in theirs; to be
where, almost all grant *salvation*, than where the greater part of
the world deny it. This Argument is very prevailing with men,
that cannot weigh it, and with women especially, that are put
in fear by violent (though causless) denying
Heaven unto them. And some of your party
since this, have set out a Book, called *Charity*,
mistaken. But beside the *Answer* fully given
to it, this alone is sufficient to Confute it.
First, that in this our *Charity* (what ever yours
be) is not mistaken, unless the *Charity of the*
Church her self were mistaken in the Case of
the *Donatists*; as shall after appear. Secondly, even *Mistaken Cha-* || S. 35. N. 3.
rity (if such it were) is far better than none at all. And if the *Mista-*
kten be ours the *None* is yours. Yea, but A.C. tells us, that this de- A. C. p. 56:
vial of salvation is grounded upon Charity, as were the like
threats of Christ, and the Holy Fathers. For there is but one
true Faith, and one true Church, and out of that there is no
salvation. And be that will not bear the *Church*, S. Matth. 18. S. Mat. 18. 17.
let him be m a Heathen, and a Publican. Therefore he says, *
more *Charisse to forewarn us of the danger, by these threats, than*
to let us run into it, through a false security. Tis true, that
there is but one true *Faith*, and but one true *Church*. But that
one, both *Faith*, and *Church*, is the *Catholike Christian*, not the
Particular Roman. And this *Catholike Christian Church*, he
B b

+ And this piece of *Canting to affright the weak* was in use in *Judas*
Martyrs time. *Quidam scimus, &c.*
ad tracundiam Iacobum Evangelium pre-
trahentes, &c. quibus & potissimum ex ob-
stinenti si sensillas Generis tradentes,
Orem sanguine Universam consummantes;
Jud. Martyr. Epist. ad Zeanum & Se-
rum. (And here us) ad tracundiam
Iacobum Ecclesiam pertinentes, &c.

* And this is
proved by
the Crad. In
which we
profess our
Belief of the
catholic; not
of the Romane
Church.

186

that will not both hear, and obey ; yea, and the *Particular Church*, in which he lives too, so far as it in *necessaries* agrees with the *Universal*, is in as bad condition as a Heathen and a Publican, and perhaps in some respects worse. And were we in this *Cafe*, we should thank *A. C.* for giving us warning of our danger. But 'tis not so. For he thunders out all these threats, and denial of salvation, because we joyn not with the *Roman Church*, in all things ; as if her Corruptions were part of the Catholike Faith of Christ. So the whole passage is a mere begging of the Question, and then threatening upon it, without all ground of Reason or Charity. In the mean time let *A. C.* look to himself, that in his false security, he run not into the danger, and loss of his own salvation, while he would seem to take such care of ours. But though this Argument prevails with the weak, yet it is much stronger in the *swining*, than the true force of it. For all Arguments are very moving, that lay their ground upon * *the Adversaries Confession* ; especially if it be confessed, and avouched to be true. But if you would speak truly, and say, Many *Protestants* indeed confess, there is *salvation* possible to be attained in the *Roman Church* ; but yet they lay withal, that the Errours of that Church are so many † (and some so great, as weakened the *Foundation*) that it is very hard to go that way to Heaven, especially to them that have had the Truth manifested ; the heart of this Argument were utterly broken. Besides, the force of this Argument lies upon two things, one directly Expressed ; the other but as upon the *Ey*.

* This is a free *Confession* of the *Adversaries* Argument against themselves, and therefore is of force. *A. C.* p. 64. But every *Confession* of *Adversaries*, or others, is to be taken with its Qualities and Conditions. If you leave out, or change them, you wrong the *Confession*, and then 'tis of no force. And so doth *A. C.* here. And though *Bellarum* makes the *confessio* of the *Adversary* a note of the true Church. L. 4. at Note Zect. 18. yet in the very beginning, where he lays his Ground, S. 1. he lays it in a plain fallacy *Assumptio quid sit simpliciter*.

† For they are no mean Differences that are between us, by *Bellarum* own *Confession*. *Agredimus et nos de rebus tristibus, sed de gravissimis Quicunq[ue] que ad ipsa Fidelis fundamenta pertinet, &c.* *Bellarum.* is profit. Operibus profud. S. 3. And therefore the Errours in them, and the Corruptions of them cannot be of small Consequence, by your own *Confession*. Yet, by your own indeed. For you *A. C.* say full as much, if not more than *Bellarum*. Thus We *Catholikes* hold all points, in which *Protestants* differ from us in Doctrine of Faith, as least not denied. *A. C.* Relation of the first Conference, p. 28.

N U M. 3.

That which is expressed, is, We and our *Adversaries* consent, that there is salvation to some in the *Roman Church*. What would you have us as malicious, (at least as rash) as your selves are to us, and deny you so much, as possibility of salvation? If we should, we might make you in some things strain for a Proof. But we have not so learned Christ, as either to return evil for evil in this beady course, or to deny salvation to some ignorant silly souls, whose humble peaceable obedience makes them safe among any sort of men, that profels the Foundation, *Christ* ; And therefore seek not to help our Cause by denying this comfort to silly Christians, as you smot fiercely do, where you can come so work upon them. And this was an old trick

of
y^d
n^d
o^r
e^o
t^o
s^t
e^o
r^o
s^o
d^o
s^o

of the *Donatists*. For in the Point of *Baptism* (whether that *Satrament was true in the Catholike Church, or in the part of Donatus) they exhorted all to be baptized among them. Why? Because both parts granted, that *Baptism was true among the Donatists*, which that *peevish Self* most unjustly denied the found part, as * S. *Augustine* delivers it. I would ask now, Had not the *Orthodox* true *Baptism* among them, because the *Baptismum, & Donatists* denied it injuriously? Or should the *Orthodox* against *Truth* have denied *Baptism*, among the *Donatists*, either to <sup>* Esse vero a-
pud Donatistas illi afferunt, &</sup> *nos concedimus, &c. L. i.
de Bap. cont.
Donat. c. 3.**

city quittance with them, or that their Argument might not be the stronger, because both parts granted? But *Mark this*, how

far you run from all common Principles of *Christian Peace*, as well as *Christian Truth*, while you deny salvation most unjustly to us, from which you are farther off your selves. Besides, if

this were, or could be made a concluding Argument, I pray,

why do not you believe with us in the Point of the *Eucharist*?

For all sides agree in the Faith of the *Church of England*, That

in the most *Blessed Sacrament*, the Worthy receiver is by

his † *Faith* made spiritu-

ally partaker of the true

and real *Body and Blood*

of Christ || truly, and re-

ally, and of all the Bene-

fits of his *Passion*. Your

Roman Catholikes add a

manner of this his Pre-

sence, *Transubstantiation*,

which many deny ; and

the *Lutherans* a manner

of this Presence, *Consu-*

bstantiation, which more

deny. If this Argument

be good, then even for

this *Consent*, it is safer

Communicating with the

Church of England, than

with the *Roman*, or *Lu-*

theran; Because all agree in this *Truth*,

not in any other Opinion.

Nay, * *Sua-*

cessarium, Sicut et 3. Thom. Disput. 50. S. 2.

himself, and he a very Learned Ad-

vocary (what say you to this A. C. ?) doth Truth force this

from him ?) Confesses plainly, *That to Believe Transub-*

stantiation is not simply necessary to Salvation. And yet he

knew well the Church had determined it. And † *Bellarmino*,

after an intricate, tedious, and almost inexplicable Discourse

about an *Adductive Conversion* (A thing which neither *Divinity*,

nor *Philosophy* ever heard of till then) is at last forced to come

+ Corpus Christi manducatur in Cana, &c. tantum Calisti & spirituali ratione : Medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur & manducatur in Cana, Fides est. Eccl. Engl. Art. 28.

After a spiritual manner by Faith on our behalf, and by the working of the Holy Ghost on the behalf of Christ. *Fulcrum in 1. Cor. 11. q. 528.*

Christus se cum omnibus bonis suis in Cena offert, & nos eum recipimus fide, &c. Galv. 4. Inst. c. 17. S. 5. Et Hooker. L. 5. S. 67. p. 176.

And say not you the same with us ? *Spiritualis manducatio, que per Animum sit, ad Christi Carnem in Sacramento pertinet.* Cajet. Tom.

2. Opus. de Euch. Tract. 2. Cap. 5. Sed spiritualiter, id est, invisibiliter, & per virtutem Spiritus Sancti. Thom. p. 3. q. 73. A. 1. ad 1.

Spiritualiter manducamus iste per Eudem & charitatem. Tens. 11. Heb. 13. Difficultate 8.

I would have no man troubled at the words *truly* and *Really*. For that blessed *Sacrament* received as it ought to be, doth *Truly* and *Really* exhibit and apply the *Body* and the *Blood* of Christ to the Receiver. So Bishop White in his Defence against

T. u. P. Edis. London. 1617. p. 138. And Calvius in 1. Cor. 10. 3.

Vero datum, &c. And again in 1. Cor. 11. 24. Neque enim Martinus tantum & Resurrections sue beneficium nobis offerit Christus, sed Corpus ipsius in quo passus est, & resurrexit. Constat Realiter (ad vnde loquuntur) hoc est. Vero nobis in Cena datur Christi Corpus, & sit Animis nostris in Cibum Salutarem, &c.

* Hoc tamen perduces Principia Metaphysica & Philosophica, & ad Fidei Doktrinam non est necessarium. Sicut et 3. Thom. Disput. 50. S. 2.

A. C. 64, 65.

+ Bellar. L. 3. de Euch. c. 16.

S. Ex his colligimus.

* Sed quidquid sit ab iudicis legundi, illud tenendum est, Conversionem Panis & Vini in Corpus & Sanguinem Christi esse substantialium, sed arcana & ineffabilem, & subiecta naturalibus conversionibus per omnia similem, &c. Bellar. in Recognit. hujus loci. Et Vid. § 38. Num. 3.

Substantial, but after a secret and ineffable manner, and not like in all things to any natural Conversion whatsoever. Now if he had left out Conversion, and affirmed only Christs real presence there, after a mysterious, and indeed an ineffable manner, no man could have spoke better. And therefore, if you will force the Argument always to make that the safest way of Salvation, which differing Parties agree on; why do you not yield to the force of the same Argument, in the Belief of the Sacrament, one of the most immediate means of Salvation, where not onely the *most*, but *all* agree; And your own greatest Clerks cannot tell what to say to the Contrary?

NUM. 4.

A.C. p. 64.

* Sed quia ita magnum firmamentum vanitatis vestre in hac sententia esse arbitramini, ut ad hoc tibi terminandam putares Epistolam quae quip recentius in Animis Legendem remaneueret, breviter responderem, &c. S. August. L. 2. cest. Lit. Pet. c. 10. And here A. C. ad hoc sibi putavit terminandam Collationem: Sed frustra, ut ap. parib. Num. 6.

I speak here for the force of the Argument, which certainly in it self is nothing, though by A. C. made of great account; For he says, 'Tis a Confession of Adversaries extorted by Truth. Just as * Petilian the Donatist brag'd in the case of Baptism. But in truth, 'tis nothing. For the Syllogism, which it frames, is this. *In Point of Faith and Salvation* 'tis safest for a man to take that way, which the differing Parties agree on. But Papists and Protestants (which are the differing Parties) agree in this, that there is salvation possible to be found in the Roman Church. Therefore 'tis safest for a man to be, and continue in the Roman Church. To the Minor Proposition then; I observe this only, that though many Learned Protestants grant this, *all* do not. And then that Proposition is not Universally true, nor able to sustain the Conclusion. For they do not in this all agree; nay, I doubt not, but there are some Protestants, which can, and do as stiffly, and as churlishly deny them *Salvation*, as they do us. And A. C. should do well to consider, whether they do it not upon as good reason at least. But for the Major Proposition; Namely, *That in Point of Faith and Salvation*, 'tis safest for a man to take that way, which the Adversary confesses, or the Differing Parties agree on. I say, that is no Metaphysical Principle, but a bare Contingent Proposition, and being indefinitely taken, may be true or false, as the matter is to which it is applied; but being taken universally, is false, and not able to lead in the Conclusion. Now that this Proposition (*In point of Faith and Salvation*, 'tis safest for a man to take that way, which the differing Parties agree on, or which the Adversary confesses) hath no strength in it self, but is sometimes true, and sometimes false, as the Matter is, about which it is conversant, is most evident. First, by Reason: Because Consent of disagreeing Parties is neither Rule, nor Proof of Truth. For Herod and Pilate, disagreeing Parties

Parties

Parties enough, yet agreed against Truth it self. But Truth rather is, or shoulde be the Rule to frame, if not to force Agreement. And secondly, by the two Instances + before given. For in the Instance between the Orthodox Church then, and the *Donatists*, this Proposition is most false; For it was a Point of Faith, & so of Salvation, that they were upon, Namely, the right use and administration of the Sacrament of *Baptism*. And yet had it been safest to take up that way, which the differing Parts agreed on, or which the adverse Part Confessed, men must needs have gone with the *Donatists* against the *Church*. And this must fall out as oft as any *Heretick* will cunningly take that way against the *Church*, which the *Donatists* did, if this Principle shall go for currant. But in the second Instance, concerning the *Eucharist*, a matter of Faith, and so of Salvation too, the same Proposition is most true. And the Reason is, because here the matter is true; Namely, *The true, and real participation of the Body and Blood of Christ in that Blessed Sacrament*. But in the former the matter was false, Namely, That *Rebaptization* was necessary after *Baptism* formally given by the *Church*. So this Proposition (*In Point of Faith and Salvation it is safest for a man to take that way, which the differing Parties agree in; or which the Adversary confesses*,) is, you see, both true and false, as men have cunning to apply it, and as the matter is, about which it is Converiant. And is therefore no Proposition able, or fit to settle a Conclusion in any sober mans minde, till the Matter contained under it, be well scanned, and examined. And yet as much use as you would make of this Proposition to amaze the weak, your selves dare not stand to it, no not where the matter is undeniably true, as shall appear in divers Particulars beside this of the *Eucharist*.

But before I add any other particular Instances, I must tell you what *A.C.* says to the two former. For he tells us, *These A.C. p. 64. two are nothing like the present case*. Nothing? That is strange indeed. Why in the first of those Cases concerning the *Donatists*, your Proposition is false; And so far from being safest, that it was no way safe for a man to take that way of Belief, and so of Salvation, which both parts agreed on. And is this nothing; Nay, is not this full, and home to the present case? For the present case is this, and no more. *That it is safest taking that way of Belief which the differing Parties agree on, or which the Adversary confesses*. And in the second of those Cases concerning the *Eucharist*, your Proposition indeed is true, not by the Truth which it hath seen in it self, *Metaphysically*, and in *Abstract*, but only in regard of the matter, to which it is applied; yet there you desert your own Proposition, where it is true. And is this nothing? Nay, is not this also full, and home to the present case, since it appears your Proposition is such as your selves dare not bide by, either when it is true, or wher-

when it is false? For in the Case of *Baptism* administered by the *Donatist*, the *Proposition* is *false*, and you dare not bide by it, for *Truth's sake*. And in the case of the *Eucharist*, the *Proposition* is *true*, and yet you dare not bide by it, for the *Church of Rome's sake*. So that *Church* (with you) cannot *erre*, and yet will not suffer you to maintain *Truth*; which not to do, is some degree of *Error*, and that no small one.

NUM. 6.
A.C. p. 65.

Well, *A.C.* goes on, and gives his Reasons why these two Instances are nothing like the present Case. For in these Cases (saith he) there are annexed other Reasons of certainly known peril of damnable *Schism* and *Heresie*, which we should incur by consenting to the *Donatists* denial of true *Baptism* among *Catholiques*: and to the *Protestants* denial, or doubting of the true substantial Presence of Christ in the *Eucharist*. But in this Case of Resolving to live and die in the *Catholike Romane Church*, there is confessedly no such peril of any damnable *Heresie*, or *Schism*, or any other sin. Here I have many Particulars to observe upon *A.C.* and you shall have them, as briefly as I can set them down.

Punct. 1. And first, I take *A.C.* at his word, that in the case of the *Donatist*, should it be followed, there would be known peril of damnable *Schism*, and *Heresie*, by denying true *Baptism* to be in the *Orthodox Church*. For by this you may see, what a sound Proposition this is (That where two Parties are dissenting, it is safest believing that in which both Parties agree, or which the Adversary confesses) for here you may see by the case of the *Donatist*, is confessed, it may lead a man, that will universally lean to it, into known and damnable *Schism* and *Heresie*. An excellent Guide, I promise you, this, is it not?

Punct. 2. Nor secondly, are these, though *A.C.* calls them so, annexed *A.C. p. 65.* Reasons; For he calls them so, but to blaunch the matter, as if they fell upon the Proposition ab extra, accidentally, and from without; Whereas they are not annexed, or pinned on, but flow naturally out of the Proposition it self. For the Proposition would seem to be *Metaphysical*, and is applicable indifferently to many *Common Beliefs* of dissenting Parties, be the point in difference what it will. Therefore if there be any thing *Heretical*, *Schismatical*, or any way evil in the Point, this Proposition being neither *Universally*, nor *necessarily* true, must needs cast him, that relies upon it, upon all these Rocks of *Heresie*, *Schism*, or what ever else follows the matter of the Proposition.

Punct. 3. Thirdly, *A.C.* doth extremely ill to joyn these Cases of the *Donatist* for *Baptism*, and the *Protestant* for the *Eucharist* together, as he doth. For this Proposition in the first concerning the *Donatist*, leads a man (as is confessed by himself) into known and damnable *Schism* and *Heresie*: but by *A.C.*'s good leave, the later concerning the *Protestant*, and the *Eucharist*, nothing so. For I hope *A.C.* dare not say, That to believe the

the true * substantial Presence of Christ, is either known, or damnable Schism, or Heresy. Now as many, and as Learned † Protestants believe and maintain this, as do

* Ceterum hū absurditatibus sublati, quicquid ad Exprimē-
lāmūnā substantialeū corporis ac Sanguinis Domini
Communicationem, que sub sacra Coena-symboliū fidelibus exhibe-
bitur, facit partis latentes recipio. Calv. L. 4. Inf. c. 17. § 19.
In Cœno mystico per Nubila-pamē & vnde christus p̄ nobis
subditus, ¶. 12. Et nos partimque substantię ejus fali sumus.
Ibid. § 11.

† § 35. Num. 3.

believe possibility of Salvation (as before is limited) in the Romane Church: Therefore they in that not guilty of either known, or damnable Schism, or Heresy, though the Donatists were of both.

Fourthly, whereas he imposes upon the Protestants, The denial ^{A.C. p. 66.} of the true and Real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; he is a great deal more bold, than true, in that also: For understand them right, and they certainly, neither deny, nor doubt it. For as for the Lutherans, as they are commonly called, their very Opinion of Consubstantiation makes it known to the world, that they neither deny, nor doubt of his true, and Real presence there. And they are Protestants. And for the Calvinists, if they might be rightly understood, they also maintain a most true and Real presence, though they cannot permit their Judgement to be Transubstantiated. And they are Protestants too.

And this is so known a Truth, that || Bellarmine confesses it. For he saith, Protestants do often grant, that the true and real Body of Christ is in the Eucharist. But he addes, That they never say (so far as he hath read) That it is there Truly and Really, unless they speak of the Supper which shall be in Heaven. Well: first, if they graint that the true and Real Body of Christ is in that Blessed Sacrament (as Bellarmine confesses they do, and 'tis most true) then A.C. is false, A.C. p. 63. who charges all the Protestants with denial, or doubtfulness in this Point. And secondly, Bellarmine himself also shews here his Ignorance, or his Malice: Ignorance, if he knew it not; Malice, if he would not know it. For the Calvinists, at least they which follow Calvin himself, do not onely believe that the true and real Body of Christ is received in the Eucharist, but that it is there, and that we partake of it vere & realiter, which are † Calvin's own words; and yet Bellarmine boldly affirms, that to his reading, no one Protestant did ever affirm it. And I, for my part, cannot believe but Bellarmine had read Calvin, and very carefully, he doth so frequently and so mainly Oppose him. Nor can that Place by any Art be shifted, or by any Violence wrested from Calvin's true meaning of the Presence of Christ in and as the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, to any Supper in Heaven whatsoever! But most manifest it is, that Quid tangeris, for ought I have read, will not serve Bellarmine to excuse him. For he himself, but in the very || Chapter going before, quotes four ¶ Bellar. 2. Places out of Calvin, in which he says expressly, That we receive

* Bellarm. L. 1. de Euchar. c. 2. § Quinto dicit, Sacramentarii sedis dicunt reale corpus Christi in cana adesse sed realiter existere dicunt, quod enim nihil loquitur de cana que

est in cana, ¶ And that he meant to brand Protestants under the name of Sacramentarii, is plain. For he says the cause of this appelle this word realiter, Figuræ Cœniæ, to the Calvinistic Real Piagent, ibid.

in the *Sacrament* the Body and the Bloud of Christ Verè, truly. So *Calvin* says it four times, and *Bellarmino* quotes the places; and yet he says in the very next Chapter, That never any Protestant said so, to his Reading. And for the *Church of England*, nothing is more plain, than that it believes and teaches the true

* The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper of the Lord, only after an Heavenly and Spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten, is Faith. *Act. xxi. Art. 28.* So here's the manner of Transubstantiation denied, but the Body of Christ twice affirmed. And in the Prayer before Consecration, thus : *Grant us grace, O Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, &c.* And again, in the second Prayer or Thanksgiving after Consecration, thus : *We give thee thanks, for that thou hast vouchsafe to feed us which have truly received these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, &c.*

and Real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, unless A. C. can make a Body no Body, and Bloud no Bloud, (as perhaps he can by Transubstantiation) as well as Bread no Bread, and Wine no Wine. And the Church of England is Protestant too. So Protestants of all sorts maintain a true and Real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and then, where's any known, or damnable Heresy here? As for the Learned of those zealous men that died in this Cause in Q. Maries days, they denied not the Real presence simply taken, but as their Opposites forced Transubstantiation upon them, as if that, and the Real presence had been all one. Whereas all the Ancient

Christians ever believed the one, and none but Modern and Superstitious Christians believe the other; if they do believe it: for I, for my part, doubt they do not. And as for the Unlearned in those times, and all times, their zeal (they holding the Foundation) may eat out their Ignorances, and leave them safe. Now that the Learned Protestants in Queen Mary's days, did not deny, nay did maintain the Real presence, will manifestly appear. For when the Commissioners obtruded to Jo. Frith the Presence of Christ's natural Body in the Sacrament, and that without all figure, or similitude: Jo. Frith acknowledges, *+ That the inward man doth as verily receive Christ's Body, as the outward man receives the Sacrament with his Mouth;* And he addes, *|| That neither side ought to make it a necessary Article of Faith, but leave it indifferent.* Nay, Archbishop Cran-

**† Jo. Fox
Martyrolog.
Tom. 2. London
1597. p. 943.
|| Fox Ibid.**

* Crammer 42. if you understand (saith * he) by this word really, Reiply, that
jud Fox ibid.
p. 1301. to, in very deed and effectually; so Christ by the grace and effi-
cacy of his Passion, is indeed, and truly present, &c. But if by this
I say ~~explic.~~ word Really, you understand + Corporaliter, Corporally, in his na-
tural, corporal, or Bellarum hath it expressly. Quod inter corporaliter & propriam sanguis & carnis, &c. probat
potissimum Argumentum, &c. Bellaria de Eucaristia, 12. § Sed tunc. And I must be bold to tell you more
than, That this is the Doctrine of the Ch. of Rome. For I must tell you too, that Bellaria here contradiceth himself. For he that tells us here, that it can be proved by many Arguments, that we receive the flesh and the
blood of Christ in the Eucharist corporaliter, saith as expressly before (had he remembered it) that though
Christ be in this Blessed Sacrament veritatis, yet (saith he) non estius corporaliter, i.e. eo modo quo non
satur & tristis Corpus, &c. Bell. 1.1. de Euchar. 1.2. Suntia Regia. So Bellaria is in a notorious contradic-
tion. Or else it will follow plainly out of him, that Christ in the Sacrament is existent one way, & received
another; which is a gross absurdity. And that corporaliter was the Doctrine of the Ch. of Rome, & meant by
Transubstantiation, is farther plain in the book called The Institution of Achyficius, set forth by the Bishops
in Convocation in 1533's time, p. 1534. c. of the Sacrament of the Altar. The words are: Under the form & figura of
bread & wine, the very body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, & substantially received, &c. And Aquinas
expresseth thus: Quia taliter substantia Corporis Christi realiter non dividitur a sua quantitate dimensio, & ab
esse accidentia, inde est, quod ex vi reali Conveniens sit in Sacramento tota quantitas dimensio corporis
Christi, & omnia accidentia eius. Thos. p. 3. q. 76. art. 4. c.

tural and Organical Body, under the Forms of Bread and Wine, tis contrary to the Holy Word of God. And so likewise Bishop Ridley. Nay, Bishop Ridley addes yet farther, and speaks so fully to this Point, as I think no man can adde to his Expression: And tis well if some Protestants except not against it. Both you and I (faith * he) agree in this: That in the Sacrament is the ^{* Apud Fox} very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary; which ascended into heaven, which sits on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead. Only we differ in modo, in the way and manner of being. We confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the Manner of Being there. I confess Christ's natural Body to be in the Sacrament by Spirit and Grace, &c. You make a grosser kinde of Being, inclosing a natural Body under the shape and form of Bread and Wine. So far, and more, Bishop Ridley. And † Archbishop Cranmer confesses, That ^{* Apud Fox} he was indeed of another Opinion, and inclining to that of Zuingli, ^{ibid. 1703.} till Bishop Ridley convinced his Judgment, & settled him in this Point. And for || Calvin, he comes no whit short of these, against the Calumny of the Romanists on that behalf. Now after all this, with what face can A. C. say (as he doth) That Protestants deny, or doubt of the true, and Real presence of Christ in the Sacrament? I cannot well tell, or am unwilling to utter.

¶ Tantum de modo questionis est, &c. Et scilicet calumpnia auferri Christum à Cana Iudea, &c. Calv. L. 4. M. c. 17. § 31. Veritatem Dei in qua acquisiri tuò licet, sine controversia amplectari. Pronunciat ille Canum suam esse Anima mea cibum, Sanguinem esse patum. Tidibus aliamentis animam Illam meam pascendam offero. In S. Cana iubet me sub Symbolo Panis & Vrai Corpus & Sanguinem suum sumere, manducare & bibere. Nihil dubito, quin ex Ipso Verè porrigit, & ego recipiam. Calv. ibid. § 32.

Fifthly, whereas tis added by A. C. That in this present case, Punct. 5: there is no peril of any damnable Heresie, Schisme, or any other A. C. p. 66: Sin, in resolving to live and die in the Roman Church. That's not so neither. For he that lives in the Roman Church, with such a Resolution, is presumed to believe as that Church believes. And he that doth so, I will not say is as guilty, but guilty is, more, or less, of the Schism which that Church first caused by her Corruptions, and now continues by them, and her power together; And of all her Damnable Opinions too, in point of Misbelief, though perhaps A.C. will not have them called Heresies, unless they have been condemned in some General Council; And of all other sins also, which the Doctrine and Misbelief of that Church leads him into. And mark it I pray. For tis one thing to live in a schismatical Church, and not Communicate with it in the Schism, or in any false Worship that attends it. For so Elias lived among the Ten Tribes, and was not schismatical, 3 Reg. 3 Reg. 17. And after him Elizeus, 4 Reg. 3. But then neither of them either countenanced the Schism, or worshipped the Calves in Dan, or in Bethel. And so also beside these Prophets, did those Thousands live in a schismatical Church, yet

3 Reg. 19.18. never bended their knee to Baal. *3. Reg. 19.* But 'tis quite another thing to live in a *Schismatical Church*, and Communicate with it in the *Schism*, and all the *Superstitions* and *Corruptions*, which that Church teaches, nay to live and die in them. For certainly here no man can so live in a *Schismatical Church*, but if he be of capacity enough, and understand it, he must needs be a *Formal Schismatick*, or an *Involved One*, if he understand it not. And in this case the *Church of Rome* is either far worse, or more cruel than the *Church of Israel*, even under *Ahab* and *Jezabel*, was. The *Synagogue* indeed was corrupted a long time, and in a great degree. But I do not finde, that this Doctrine, *You must sacrifice in the high places*: Or this, *You may not go and worship at the one Altar in Jerusalem*, was either taught by the *Priests*, or maintained by the *Prophets*, or enjoyned the people by the *Sanedrim*: Nay, can you shew me when any *Jew* living there devoutly according to the *Law*, was ever punished for omitting the *One* of these, or doing the *Other*? But the *Church of Rome* hath solemnly decreed her *Errors*: And erring, hath yet decreed withal, *That she cannot erre*. And imposed upon Learned men, disputed and improbable Opinions, *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, and *Forbearance of the Cup* in the blessed *Eucharist*; even against the expreſſ Command of our Saviour, and that for *Articles of Faith*. And to keep off *Disobedience*, what ever the Corruption be, she hath bound up her *Decrees* upon pain of *Excommunication*, and all that follows upon it. Nay, this is not enough, unless the *Fagot* be kindled to light them the way. This then may be enough for us to leave *Rome*, though the old *Prophet* forsook not *Israel*.

3 Reg. 13.11. *3. Reg. 13.* And therefore in this present case there's peril, great peril of damnable both *Schism* and *Heresie*, and other sin, by living and dying in the *Roman Faith*, tainted with so many *superstitions*, as at this day it is, and their

**Petilianus dixit, Unite ad Ecclesiam populi, & aufugite traditores (ita Orthodoxos tum appellavit) si cum iijdem perire non vultis. Nam ut facili cognoscatis quid ipsi sunt rei, de fide nostra optimè judicant. Ego illorum infelices baptizo. Illi mos (quid ab sit) recipiunt baptizatos, que omnino non facerent, si in Baptismo nostro culpas aliquas agnoverissent. Videlicet ergo quid damus, quam sanctum sit, quod destruere metuit Sacrilegus Inimicus. S. Augustinus respondet. Sic approbamus in Hereticis Baptismum, non Hereticorum, sed Christi, sciat in Fornicatibus, Idolatriis, Veneficiis, &c. approbamus Baptismum non eorum, sed Christi. Omnes enim ipsi, inter quos & Heretici sunt, sicut dicit Apostolus: Regnum Dei non possidebunt, &c. S. August. 2. 2. con. Lit. Petiliani. 6. 108.*

Tyranny to boot. So that here I may answer A. C. just as * S. Augustine answered Petilian the *Donatist*, in the fore-named case of *Baptism*. For when Petilian pleaded the *Concession* of his Adversaries, *That Baptism, or the Donatists administered it, was good and lawful, and thence inferred* (just as the *Jeſuite* doth against me) *that it was better for men to joyn with bis Congregation, than with the Church* S. Augustine answers; *We do indeed approve among Hereticks Baptism, but so, not as it is the Baptism of Hereticks, but as it is the Baptism of Christ. Just as we approve the Baptism of Adulterers, Idolaters, Witchers,*

Witches, and yet not as 'tis theirs ; but as 'tis Christ's Baptism.

For none of these, for all their Baptism, shall inherit the Kingdom of God.

And the Apostle reckons Hereticks among them, * Galat. 5.

And again afterwards : It is not therefore yours

(faith + Saint Augustine) which we fear to destroy,

but Christ's, which even among the Sacrilegious,

is of, and in it self, holy. Now you shall see

how full this comes to our Petilianist A.C. (for he is one of the

Contractors of the Church of Christ to Rome, as the Do-

natists confined it to Africk.) And he cries out, That a Pos-

sibility of Salvation, is a free Confession of the Adversaries,

and is of force against them, and to be thought extorted from

them by force of Truth it self. I answer. I do indeed for

my part (leaving other men free to their own judgment)

acknowledge a Possibility of Salvation in the Roman Church.

But so, as that which I grant to Romanists, is not as they

are Romanists, but as they are Christians, that is, as they be-

lieve the Creed, and hold the Foundation Christ himself, not

as they associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to the

gross Superstitions of the Romish Church. Nor do I fear to

destroy quod ipsorum est, that which is theirs ; but yet I dare

not proceed so roughly, as with theirs, or for theirs to de-

ny, or weaken the Foundation, which is Christ, even a-

mong them ; and which is, and remains holy even in the

midst of their Superstitions ; And I am willing to hope there

are many among them, which keep within that Church, and

yet wish the Superstitions abolished which they know, and

which pray to God to forgive their errors in what they

know not, and which hold the Foundation firm, and live ac-

cordingly, and which would have all things amended that

are amiss, were it in their power. And to such I dare not

deny a Possibility of Salvation, for that which is Christ in

them, though they hazard themselves extremely by keeping

so close to that, which is Superstition, and in the Case of I-

mages, comes too near Idolatry. Nor can A.C. shift this off

by adding, living and dying in the Romane Church. For

this living and dying in the Romane Church, (as is before

expressed) cannot take away the Possibility of Salvation

from them which believe, and repent of whatsoever is errour,

or sin in them, be it sin known to them, or be it not. But

then perhaps A.C. will reply, that if this be so, I must

then maintain, that a Donatist also, living and dying in

Schism, might be saved. To which I answer two ways.

First, that a plain honest Donatist, having (as is confe-

ted) true Baptism, and holding the Foundation (as for

such as they are) ought

* Galat. 5. 19, 20, 21.

† Non ergo vestrum est quod diffidere
metimus, sed Christi ; quod & in sa-
cralegio per se suntum est. S. Augus.
Ibid.

* For though *Patreolus* will make *Donatus*, and from him the *Donatists*, to be guilty of an impious Heretie (I doubt he means *Arianism*, though he name it not,) in making the Son of God less than the Father, and the Holy Ghost less than the Son. *L. 4. de Heret. Her. 14.* yet these things are most manifest out of *S. Aug.* concerning them, who lived with them both in time and place, and understood them, and their *tenets* far better than *Patreolus* could.

And first, *S. Aug.* tells us concerning them : *Arianis, Patriis, & Filiis, & Spiritu Sancto, diversas substantias esse dicunt. Donatisti autem unam Trinitatis substantiam confitentes. So they are no Arians.*

Secondly, *Si aliqui eorum minorem Filium esse dixerint quoniam Pater est, ejusdem tamen substantiae non negantur.* But this is but *si aliqui*, if any : so 'twas doubtful, this too, though *Patreolus* delivers it positively.

Thirdly, *Plurime verbi in hoc se dicunt, omnino credere de Patri, & Filiis, & Spiritu Sancto, quod Catholicus credit Ecclesia. Ne infra cum illis varietur Quelio, sed de sola Communione resilienter utinam, &c. De sola. Only about the Union with the Church. Therefore they err not in Fundamental Points of Faith.* And

Lastly, All that can farther be laid against them, is, That some of them, to win the *Goths* to them, when they were powerful, laid. *Hoc se Credere quod illi credant.* Now the *Goths* (for the most) were *Arians*. But then, saith *S. Aug.* they were but *nominis*, some of them. And of this some it was no more certain, than *ficti audimus*, as we have heard, *S. Aug.* knew it not. And then if it were true of some, yet *Mojorius* (sororum Authoritate convincuntur) ; *Quia ne Donatus ipse sic credidisset affirmitur, de cuius parte sit illi gloriantur.* *S. Aug. Epist. 50.* Where *Patreolus* is again deceived ; for he says expressly, that *Donatus* affirmed the Son to be less than the Father. *Ingenus ille affirbat, &c.* But then indeed, (and which perchance deceived *Patreolus*) beside *Donatus* the founder of this Heretie, there was another *Donatus*, who succeeded *Mojorius* at *Carthage*, and he was guilty of the Heretie, which *Patreolus* mentions, *Et extant scripta eius ubi apparet*, as *S. Aug.* confesses, *L. 1. de Heret. Her. 69.* But then *S. Aug.* adds there also, *ne facile in illi quisquam*, that scarce any of the *Donatists* did so much as know, that this *Donatus* held that Opinion, much less did they believe it themselves. *S. Aug. Ibid.*

^{100.6.3.1.} ^{100.6.3.2.} ^{100.6.3.3.} ^{100.6.3.4.} ^{100.6.3.5.} ^{100.6.3.6.} ^{100.6.3.7.} ^{100.6.3.8.} ^{100.6.3.9.} ^{100.6.3.10.} ^{100.6.3.11.} ^{100.6.3.12.} ^{100.6.3.13.} ^{100.6.3.14.} ^{100.6.3.15.} ^{100.6.3.16.} ^{100.6.3.17.} ^{100.6.3.18.} ^{100.6.3.19.} ^{100.6.3.20.} ^{100.6.3.21.} ^{100.6.3.22.} ^{100.6.3.23.} ^{100.6.3.24.} ^{100.6.3.25.} ^{100.6.3.26.} ^{100.6.3.27.} ^{100.6.3.28.} ^{100.6.3.29.} ^{100.6.3.30.} ^{100.6.3.31.} ^{100.6.3.32.} ^{100.6.3.33.} ^{100.6.3.34.} ^{100.6.3.35.} ^{100.6.3.36.} ^{100.6.3.37.} ^{100.6.3.38.} ^{100.6.3.39.} ^{100.6.3.40.} ^{100.6.3.41.} ^{100.6.3.42.} ^{100.6.3.43.} ^{100.6.3.44.} ^{100.6.3.45.} ^{100.6.3.46.} ^{100.6.3.47.} ^{100.6.3.48.} ^{100.6.3.49.} ^{100.6.3.50.} ^{100.6.3.51.} ^{100.6.3.52.} ^{100.6.3.53.} ^{100.6.3.54.} ^{100.6.3.55.} ^{100.6.3.56.} ^{100.6.3.57.} ^{100.6.3.58.} ^{100.6.3.59.} ^{100.6.3.60.} ^{100.6.3.61.} ^{100.6.3.62.} ^{100.6.3.63.} ^{100.6.3.64.} ^{100.6.3.65.} ^{100.6.3.66.} ^{100.6.3.67.} ^{100.6.3.68.} ^{100.6.3.69.} ^{100.6.3.70.} ^{100.6.3.71.} ^{100.6.3.72.} ^{100.6.3.73.} ^{100.6.3.74.} ^{100.6.3.75.} ^{100.6.3.76.} ^{100.6.3.77.} ^{100.6.3.78.} ^{100.6.3.79.} ^{100.6.3.80.} ^{100.6.3.81.} ^{100.6.3.82.} ^{100.6.3.83.} ^{100.6.3.84.} ^{100.6.3.85.} ^{100.6.3.86.} ^{100.6.3.87.} ^{100.6.3.88.} ^{100.6.3.89.} ^{100.6.3.90.} ^{100.6.3.91.} ^{100.6.3.92.} ^{100.6.3.93.} ^{100.6.3.94.} ^{100.6.3.95.} ^{100.6.3.96.} ^{100.6.3.97.} ^{100.6.3.98.} ^{100.6.3.99.} ^{100.6.3.100.} ^{100.6.3.101.} ^{100.6.3.102.} ^{100.6.3.103.} ^{100.6.3.104.} ^{100.6.3.105.} ^{100.6.3.106.} ^{100.6.3.107.} ^{100.6.3.108.} ^{100.6.3.109.} ^{100.6.3.110.} ^{100.6.3.111.} ^{100.6.3.112.} ^{100.6.3.113.} ^{100.6.3.114.} ^{100.6.3.115.} ^{100.6.3.116.} ^{100.6.3.117.} ^{100.6.3.118.} ^{100.6.3.119.} ^{100.6.3.120.} ^{100.6.3.121.} ^{100.6.3.122.} ^{100.6.3.123.} ^{100.6.3.124.} ^{100.6.3.125.} ^{100.6.3.126.} ^{100.6.3.127.} ^{100.6.3.128.} ^{100.6.3.129.} ^{100.6.3.130.} ^{100.6.3.131.} ^{100.6.3.132.} ^{100.6.3.133.} ^{100.6.3.134.} ^{100.6.3.135.} ^{100.6.3.136.} ^{100.6.3.137.} ^{100.6.3.138.} ^{100.6.3.139.} ^{100.6.3.140.} ^{100.6.3.141.} ^{100.6.3.142.} ^{100.6.3.143.} ^{100.6.3.144.} ^{100.6.3.145.} ^{100.6.3.146.} ^{100.6.3.147.} ^{100.6.3.148.} ^{100.6.3.149.} ^{100.6.3.150.} ^{100.6.3.151.} ^{100.6.3.152.} ^{100.6.3.153.} ^{100.6.3.154.} ^{100.6.3.155.} ^{100.6.3.156.} ^{100.6.3.157.} ^{100.6.3.158.} ^{100.6.3.159.} ^{100.6.3.160.} ^{100.6.3.161.} ^{100.6.3.162.} ^{100.6.3.163.} ^{100.6.3.164.} ^{100.6.3.165.} ^{100.6.3.166.} ^{100.6.3.167.} ^{100.6.3.168.} ^{100.6.3.169.} ^{100.6.3.170.} ^{100.6.3.171.} ^{100.6.3.172.} ^{100.6.3.173.} ^{100.6.3.174.} ^{100.6.3.175.} ^{100.6.3.176.} ^{100.6.3.177.} ^{100.6.3.178.} ^{100.6.3.179.} ^{100.6.3.180.} ^{100.6.3.181.} ^{100.6.3.182.} ^{100.6.3.183.} ^{100.6.3.184.} ^{100.6.3.185.} ^{100.6.3.186.} ^{100.6.3.187.} ^{100.6.3.188.} ^{100.6.3.189.} ^{100.6.3.190.} ^{100.6.3.191.} ^{100.6.3.192.} ^{100.6.3.193.} ^{100.6.3.194.} ^{100.6.3.195.} ^{100.6.3.196.} ^{100.6.3.197.} ^{100.6.3.198.} ^{100.6.3.199.} ^{100.6.3.200.} ^{100.6.3.201.} ^{100.6.3.202.} ^{100.6.3.203.} ^{100.6.3.204.} ^{100.6.3.205.} ^{100.6.3.206.} ^{100.6.3.207.} ^{100.6.3.208.} ^{100.6.3.209.} ^{100.6.3.210.} ^{100.6.3.211.} ^{100.6.3.212.} ^{100.6.3.213.} ^{100.6.3.214.} ^{100.6.3.215.} ^{100.6.3.216.} ^{100.6.3.217.} ^{100.6.3.218.} ^{100.6.3.219.} ^{100.6.3.220.} ^{100.6.3.221.} ^{100.6.3.222.} ^{100.6.3.223.} ^{100.6.3.224.} ^{100.6.3.225.} ^{100.6.3.226.} ^{100.6.3.227.} ^{100.6.3.228.} ^{100.6.3.229.} ^{100.6.3.230.} ^{100.6.3.231.} ^{100.6.3.232.} ^{100.6.3.233.} ^{100.6.3.234.} ^{100.6.3.235.} ^{100.6.3.236.} ^{100.6.3.237.} ^{100.6.3.238.} ^{100.6.3.239.} ^{100.6.3.240.} ^{100.6.3.241.} ^{100.6.3.242.} ^{100.6.3.243.} ^{100.6.3.244.} ^{100.6.3.245.} ^{100.6.3.246.} ^{100.6.3.247.} ^{100.6.3.248.} ^{100.6.3.249.} ^{100.6.3.250.} ^{100.6.3.251.} ^{100.6.3.252.} ^{100.6.3.253.} ^{100.6.3.254.} ^{100.6.3.255.} ^{100.6.3.256.} ^{100.6.3.257.} ^{100.6.3.258.} ^{100.6.3.259.} ^{100.6.3.260.} ^{100.6.3.261.} ^{100.6.3.262.} ^{100.6.3.263.} ^{100.6.3.264.} ^{100.6.3.265.} ^{100.6.3.266.} ^{100.6.3.267.} ^{100.6.3.268.} ^{100.6.3.269.} ^{100.6.3.270.} ^{100.6.3.271.} ^{100.6.3.272.} ^{100.6.3.273.} ^{100.6.3.274.} ^{100.6.3.275.} ^{100.6.3.276.} ^{100.6.3.277.} ^{100.6.3.278.} ^{100.6.3.279.} ^{100.6.3.280.} ^{100.6.3.281.} ^{100.6.3.282.} ^{100.6.3.283.} ^{100.6.3.284.} ^{100.6.3.285.} ^{100.6.3.286.} ^{100.6.3.287.} ^{100.6.3.288.} ^{100.6.3.289.} ^{100.6.3.290.} ^{100.6.3.291.} ^{100.6.3.292.} ^{100.6.3.293.} ^{100.6.3.294.} ^{100.6.3.295.} ^{100.6.3.296.} ^{100.6.3.297.} ^{100.6.3.298.} ^{100.6.3.299.} ^{100.6.3.300.} ^{100.6.3.301.} ^{100.6.3.302.} ^{100.6.3.303.} ^{100.6.3.304.} ^{100.6.3.305.} ^{100.6.3.306.} ^{100.6.3.307.} ^{100.6.3.308.} ^{100.6.3.309.} ^{100.6.3.310.} ^{100.6.3.311.} ^{100.6.3.312.} ^{100.6.3.313.} ^{100.6.3.314.} ^{100.6.3.315.} ^{100.6.3.316.} ^{100.6.3.317.} ^{100.6.3.318.} ^{100.6.3.319.} ^{100.6.3.320.} ^{100.6.3.321.} ^{100.6.3.322.} ^{100.6.3.323.} ^{100.6.3.324.} ^{100.6.3.325.} ^{100.6.3.326.} ^{100.6.3.327.} ^{100.6.3.328.} ^{100.6.3.329.} ^{100.6.3.330.} ^{100.6.3.331.} ^{100.6.3.332.} ^{100.6.3.333.} ^{100.6.3.334.} ^{100.6.3.335.} ^{100.6.3.336.} ^{100.6.3.337.} ^{100.6.3.338.} ^{100.6.3.339.} ^{100.6.3.340.} ^{100.6.3.341.} ^{100.6.3.342.} ^{100.6.3.343.} ^{100.6.3.344.} ^{100.6.3.345.} ^{100.6.3.346.} ^{100.6.3.347.} ^{100.6.3.348.} ^{100.6.3.349.} ^{100.6.3.350.} ^{100.6.3.351.} ^{100.6.3.352.} ^{100.6.3.353.} ^{100.6.3.354.} ^{100.6.3.355.} ^{100.6.3.356.} ^{100.6.3.357.} ^{100.6.3.358.} ^{100.6.3.359.} ^{100.6.3.360.} ^{100.6.3.361.} ^{100.6.3.362.} ^{100.6.3.363.} ^{100.6.3.364.} ^{100.6.3.365.} ^{100.6.3.366.} ^{100.6.3.367.} ^{100.6.3.368.} ^{100.6.3.369.} ^{100.6.3.370.} ^{100.6.3.371.} ^{100.6.3.372.} ^{100.6.3.373.} ^{100.6.3.374.} ^{100.6.3.375.} ^{100.6.3.376.} ^{100.6.3.377.} ^{100.6.3.378.} ^{100.6.3.379.} ^{100.6.3.380.} ^{100.6.3.381.} ^{100.6.3.382.} ^{100.6.3.383.} ^{100.6.3.384.} ^{100.6.3.385.} ^{100.6.3.386.} ^{100.6.3.387.} ^{100.6.3.388.} ^{100.6.3.389.} ^{100.6.3.390.} ^{100.6.3.391.} ^{100.6.3.392.} ^{100.6.3.393.} ^{100.6.3.394.} ^{100.6.3.395.} ^{100.6.3.396.} ^{100.6.3.397.} ^{100.6.3.398.} ^{100.6.3.399.} ^{100.6.3.400.} ^{100.6.3.401.} ^{100.6.3.402.} ^{100.6.3.403.} ^{100.6.3.404.} ^{100.6.3.405.} ^{100.6.3.406.} ^{100.6.3.407.} ^{100.6.3.408.} ^{100.6.3.409.} ^{100.6.3.410.} ^{100.6.3.411.} ^{100.6.3.412.} ^{100.6.3.413.} ^{100.6.3.414.} ^{100.6.3.415.} ^{100.6.3.416.} ^{100.6.3.417.} ^{100.6.3.418.} ^{100.6.3.419.} ^{100.6.3.420.} ^{100.6.3.421.} ^{100.6.3.422.} ^{100.6.3.423.} ^{100.6.3.424.} ^{100.6.3.425.} ^{100.6.3.426.} ^{100.6.3.427.} ^{100.6.3.428.} ^{100.6.3.429.} ^{100.6.3.430.} ^{100.6.3.431.} ^{100.6.3.432.} ^{100.6.3.433.} ^{100.6.3.434.} ^{100.6.3.435.} ^{100.6.3.436.} ^{100.6.3.437.} ^{100.6.3.438.} ^{100.6.3.439.} ^{100.6.3.440.} ^{100.6.3.441.} ^{100.6.3.442.} ^{100.6.3.443.} ^{100.6.3.444.} ^{100.6.3.445.} ^{100.6.3.446.} ^{100.6.3.447.} ^{100.6.3.448.} ^{100.6.3.449.} ^{100.6.3.450.} ^{100.6.3.451.} ^{100.6.3.452.} ^{100.6.3.453.} ^{100.6.3.454.} ^{100.6.3.455.} ^{100.6.3.456.} ^{100.6.3.457.} ^{100.6.3.458.} ^{100.6.3.459.} ^{100.6.3.460.} ^{100.6.3.461.} ^{100.6.3.462.} ^{100.6.3.463.} ^{100.6.3.464.} ^{100.6.3.465.} ^{100.6.3.466.} ^{100.6.3.467.} ^{100.6.3.468.} ^{100.6.3.469.} ^{100.6.3.470.} ^{100.6.3.471.} ^{100.6.3.472.} ^{100.6.3.473.} ^{100.6.3.474.} ^{100.6.3.475.} ^{100.6.3.476.} ^{100.6.3.477.} ^{100.6.3.478.} ^{100.6.3.479.} ^{100.6.3.480.} ^{100.6.3.481.} ^{100.6.3.482.} ^{100.6.3.483.} ^{100.6.3.484.} ^{100.6.3.485.} ^{100.6.3.486.} ^{100.6.3.487.} ^{100.6.3.488.} ^{100.6.3.489.} ^{100.6.3.490.} ^{100.6.3.491.} ^{100.6.3.492.} ^{100.6.3.493.} ^{100.6.3.494.} ^{100.6.3.495.} ^{100.6.3.496.} ^{100.6.3.497.} ^{100.6.3.498.} ^{100.6.3.499.} ^{100.6.3.500.} ^{100.6.3.501.} ^{100.6.3.502.} ^{100.6.3.503.} ^{100.6.3.504.} ^{100.6.3.505.} ^{100.6.3.506.} ^{100.6.3.507.} ^{100.6.3.508.} ^{100.6.3.509.} ^{100.6.3.510.} ^{100.6.3.511.} ^{100.6.3.512.} ^{100.6.3.513.} ^{100.6.3.514.} ^{100.6.3.515.} ^{100.6.3.516.} ^{100.6.3.517.} ^{100.6.3.518.} ^{100.6.3.519.} ^{100.6.3.520.} ^{100.6.3.521.} ^{100.6.3.522.} ^{100.6.3.523.} ^{100.6.3.524.} ^{100.6.3.525.} ^{100.6.3.526.} ^{100.6.3.527.} ^{100.6.3.528.} ^{100.6.3.529.} ^{100.6.3.530.} ^{100.6.3.531.} ^{100.6.3.532.} ^{100.6.3.533.} ^{100.6.3.534.} ^{100.6.3.535.} ^{100.6.3.536.} ^{100.6.3.537.} ^{100.6.3.538.} ^{100.6.3.539.} ^{100.6.3.540.} ^{100.6.3.541.} ^{100.6.3.542.} ^{100.6.3.543.} ^{100.6.3.544.} ^{100.6.3.545.} ^{100.6.3.546.} ^{100.6.3.547.} ^{100.6.3.548.} ^{100.6.3.549.} ^{100.6.3.550.} ^{100.6.3.551.} ^{100.6.3.552.} ^{100.6.3.553.} ^{100.6.3.554.} ^{100.6.3.555.} ^{100.6.3.556.} ^{100.6.3.557.} ^{100.6.3.558.} ^{100.6.3.559.} ^{100.6.3.560.} ^{100.6.3.561.} ^{100.6.3.562.} ^{100.6.3.563.} ^{100.6.3.564.} ^{100.6.3.565.} ^{100.6.3.566.} ^{100.6.3.567.} ^{100.6.3.568.} ^{100.6.3.569.} ^{100.6.3.570.} ^{100.6.3.571.} ^{100.6.3.572.} ^{100.6.3.573.} ^{100.6.3.574.} ^{100.6.3.575.} ^{100.6.3.576.} ^{100.6.3.577.} ^{100.6.3.578.} ^{100.6.3.579.} ^{100.6.3.580.} ^{100.6.3.581.} ^{100.6.3.582.} ^{100.6.3.583.} ^{100.6.3.584.} ^{100.6.3.585.} ^{100.6.3.586.} ^{100.6.3.587.} ^{100.6.3.588.} ^{100.6.3.589.} ^{100.6.3.590.} ^{100.6.3.591.} ^{100.6.3.592.} ^{100.6.3.593.} ^{100.6.3.594.} ^{100.6.3.595.} ^{100.6.3.596.} ^{100.6.3.597.} ^{100.6.3.598.} ^{100.6.3.599.} ^{100.6.3.600.} ^{100.6.3.601.} ^{100.6.3.602.} ^{100.6.3.603.} ^{100.6.3.604.} ^{100.6.3.605.} ^{100.6.3.606.} ^{100.6.3.607.} ^{100.6.3.608.} ^{100.6.3.609.} ^{100.6.3.610.} ^{100.6.3.611.} ^{100.6.3.612.} ^{100.6.3.613.} ^{100.6.3.614.} ^{100.6.3.615.} ^{100.6.3.616.} ^{100.6.3.617.} ^{100.6.3.618.} ^{100.6.3.619.} ^{100.6.3.620.} ^{100.6.3.621.} ^{100.6.3.622.} ^{100.6.3.623.} ^{100.6.3.624.} ^{100.6.3.625.} ^{100.6.3.626.} ^{100.6.3.627.} ^{100.6.3.628.} ^{100.6.3.629.} ^{100.6.3.630.} ^{100.6.3.631.} ^{100.6.3.632.} ^{100.6.3.633.} ^{100.6.3.634.} ^{100.6.3.635.} ^{100.6.3.636.} ^{100.6.3.637.} ^{100.6.3.638.} ^{100.6.3.639.} ^{100.6.3.640.} ^{100.6.3.641.} ^{100.6.3.642.} ^{100.6.3.643.} ^{100.6.3.644.} ^{100.6.3.645.} ^{100.6.3.646.} ^{100.6.3.647.} ^{100.6.3.648.} ^{100.6.3.649.} ^{100.6.3.650.} ^{100.6.3.651.} ^{100.6.3.652.} ^{100.6.3.653.} ^{100.6.3.654.} ^{100.6.3.655.} ^{100.6.3.656.} ^{100.6.3.657.} ^{100.6.3.658.} ^{100.6.3.659.} ^{100.6.3.660.} ^{100.6.3.661.} ^{100.6.3.662.} ^{100.6.3.663.} ^{100.6.3.664.} ^{100.6.3.665.} ^{100.6.3.666.} ¹

if some Protestants should say there is peril of Damnation to live and die in the Roman Faith, their saying is nothing in comparison of the number or worth of those that say, there is none. So A.C. again. And beside, they which say it, are contradicted by their own more Learned Brethren. Here A.C. speaks A.C. p. 66. very confusedly. But whether he speak of Protestants, or Romanists, or mixes both, the matter is not great. For as for the Number and Worth of men, they are no necessary Concluders for Truth. Not Number; for who would be judged by the Many? The time was when the * Arrians were too many for the Orthodox. Not Worth simply, for that once + misled, is of all other the greatest misleader. And yet God forbid, that to Worth weaker men should not yield in difficult and Perplexed Questions, yet so, as that when Matters Fundamental in the Faith come in Question they finally rest upon an higher, and clearer certainty than can be found in either Number or Weight of men. Besides, if you mean your own Party, you have not yet proved your Party more worthy for Life of Learning than the Protestants. Prove that first, and then it will be time to tell you, how worthy many of your Popes have been for either Life or Learning. As for the rest, you may blush to say it. For all Protestants unanimously agree in this, That there is great peril of Damnation for any man to live and die in the Roman persuasion. And you are not able to produce any one Protestant, that ever said the contrary. And therefore that is a most notorious slander, where you say, that they which affirm this peril of Damnation, are contradicted A.C. p. 66. by their own more Learned Brethren.

And thus having cleared the way against the Exceptions of N.U.M. 7. A.C. to the two former Instances, I will now proceed (as I || promised) to make this farther appear, that A.C. and his Feli- || S.35.N.4. lows dare not stand to that ground, which is here laid down. Namely, That in Point of Faith and Salvation, it is safest for a man to take that way which the Adversary Confesses to be true, or whereon the differing Parties agree. And that if they do stand to it, they must be forced to maintain the Church of England in many things against the Church of Rome. And

* Ingenui totus Orbis, & Arrianum se eis miratus est. S. Hier. advers. Luciferian. post medium. p. 2. Arrianorum Venenum non iam partiumculam quendam, sed per orbem totum contaminaverat, adeo ut propè nucleus Latinorum Sermonis Episcoporum, partim vi, partim fraude deceptio, caligo quedam mentibus offendiretur. &c. Vin. Lit. cont. Hier. c. 6. Ecclesia non Parvissibus consistit, sed in Dogmatum veritate. Ecclesia ibi est, ubi fides vera est. Ceterum ante annos quindecim, aut triginta, Parviss omnes hic Ecclesiarum Hereticis (de Arrianis & aliis Hereticis loquuntur) possidebant, &c. Ecclesia autem illuc erat, ubi fides vera erat. S. Hier. in Psal. 133. Constantius. Tantum Orbis terra pars, Liberi, in te residet, ut tu solus homini Impio (de Achanafio loquitur) subdicio venire, & pacem Orbis ac mundi potius dirimere audias. Liberius. Esto quod ego solus sum, non tamen propterea causa fidei sit inferior; nam olim tres solus erant reperti, qui Regis mandato resisterent, &c. Theod. I. 2. Hist. Eccles. c. 16. Dialogo inter Constant. Imp. & Liberium Papam. So that Pepe did not think Antientide any great note of the true Church. Hibi sunt, &c. qui Ecclesiam multitudine definirent, & parvum gregem apparuantur, &c. Greg. Naz. Orat. 25. præf. Nay, the Arrians were grown to that boldness, that they Objected to the Catholicks of that time Paupertatem, the thinness of their number, Greg. Naz. Carm. de vita sua, p. 24. Edit. Paris. 1611. Quam ejus tamquam essent de Civitatis, jactabat in defensis suis Synagogis illud: Multi vocati, pauci electi, Socr. L. 1. Hist. Eccles. I. 1. Error Origenis & Tertulliani magna fuit in Ecclesia Dei Populi Unitatio, Vin. Lit. cont. Hier. c. 23, & 24.

Punct. 1. And first, I Instance in the *Article of our Saviour Christ's Descent into Hell*. I hope the *Church of Rome* believes this *Article*, and withal that *Hell* is the place of the Damned; so doth the *Church of England*. In this then these dissenting Churches agree; Therefore according to the former *Rule* (yea and here in *Truth* too) 'tis safest for a man to believe this *Article of the Creed*, as both agree: That is, that Christ descended in Soul into the Place of the Damned; but this the *Romanists* will not endure at any hand. *For the School agree in it, That the Soul of Christ in the time of his death went really no farther than in Limbum Patrum*, which is not the place of the Damned; but a Region or Quarter in the upper part of Hell, (as they call it) built up there by the *Romanist*, without *Licence* of either *Scripture*, or the *Primitive Church*. And a man would wonder how those Builders with untempered Mortar found light enough in that dark Place to build as they have done.

Punct. 2. Secondly, I'll instance in the *Institution of the Sacrament in both kinds*. That Christ *Instituted* it so, is confessed by both Churches; and the *Ancient Churches received* it so, is agreed by both Churches. Therefore according to the former *Rule* (and here in *Truth* too) 'tis safest for a man to receive this Sacrament in both kinds. And yet here this Ground of *A.C.* must not stand for good, no not at *Rome*, but to receive in one kinde is enough for the *Laity*. And the poor + *Bohemians* must have a *Dispensation*, that it may be lawful for them to receive the Sacrament as Christ commanded them. *And this must not be granted to them neither, unless they will acknowledge* (most opposite to *Truth*) *that they are not bound by Divine Law to receive it in both kinds*. And here their Building with untempered Mortar appears most manifestly. For they have no shew to maintain this, but the fiction of *Thomas of Aquin*, *That he which receives the Body of Christ, receives also his Blood per concomitantiam*, by *concomitancy*; because the Blood goes always with the Body;

¶ Tho. p. 3. q. of which Term ¶ Thomas was the first Author I can yet finde.

*¶ A. c. &c. First then, if this be true, I hope Christ knew it: And then why did he so unusefully institute it in both kinds? Next, if this be true, *Concomitancy* accompanies the *Priest*, as well as the *People*; and then why may not he receive it in one kinde also? Thirdly, this is apparently not true: For the *Eucharist* is a *Sanguinis effusus*, of Blood shed, and poured out; And Blood poured out, and so severed from the Body, goes not along with the Body *per concomitantiam*. And yet Christ must rather erre, or proceed I know not how in the *Institution of the Sacrament in both kindes*, rather than the *Holy unerring church of Rome* may do amiss in the Determination for it, and the *Administration* of it in one kinde. Nor will the Distinction, *That Christ instituted this as a Sacrifice, to which both**

kinds

kinds were necessary, serve the turn: For suppose that true, yet he instituted it, as a Sacrament also, or else that Sacrament had no Institution from Christ; which I presume A. C. dares not affirm. And that Institution which the Sacrament had from Christ, was in both kindes.

And since here's mention happen'd of *Sacrifice*, my *Third In- Punct. 3.* stancce shall be in the *Sacrifice* which is offer'd up to God in that *Great and High Mystery* of our *Redemption* by the death of *Christ*.

For as *Christ* offer'd up

* himself once for all, a full and all-sufficient *Sacrifice* for the sin of the *whole world*: So did He Institute, and Command a † *Memory* of this *Sacrifice* in a *Sacrament*, even till his coming again. For

at, and in the *Eucharist*, we offer up to God *three Sacrifices*. One by the *Priest* onely, that's the || *Commemorative Sacrifice* of *Christ's Death* represented in *Bread broken, and Wine poured out*. Another by the * *Priest* and the *People*, joynly; and that is the *Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving*, for all the Benefits and Graces we receive by the precious death of

* *Christ* by his own Blood entred once into the Holy place, and obtained eternal *Redemption* for us. *Heb. 9.12.* And this was done by way of *Sacrifice*; by the offering of the Body of Jesus *Christ* once made. *Heb. 10.10.* *Christ* gave himself for us, to be an *Offering*, and a *Sacrifice* of a sweet smelling savour unto God. *Eph. 5.2.* Out of which place the School infers, *Passionem Christi verum Sacrificium suum*. *Tho. p. 3. q. 48. art. 3. c.* *Christ* did suffer death upon the *Cross* for our *Redemption*, and made there, by his one *Oblation* of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient *Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction* for the sins of the *whole World*. *Eccles. Angl. in Canon Confessiones Eucar.*

† And *Christ* did Institute, and in his holy *Gospel* Command us to continue a *Perpetual Memory* of that his precious *Death*, until his Coming again. *Eccles. Angl. ioid.*

|| *Sacramentum hoc est Commemorativum Dominicum Passionis, que fuit verum Sacrificium; & sic Nominatur Sacrificium.* *Tho. p. 3. q. 73. A. 4. C.* *Christ* being Offer'd up once for all in his own proper Person, is yet said to be Offer'd up, &c. in the Celebration of the *Sacrament*; Beante his *Oblation* once for ever made, is thereby Represented. *Lambert in Fox his Martyrol. VOL. 2. Edit. Lond. 1579. p. 1623.* *Et postea, 'Tis a Memorial, or Representation thereof.* *Ibid.* The Master of the Sentences judged truly in this Point, saying: That which is Offer'd and Consecrated of the *Priest*, is called a *Sacrifice* and *Oblation*, because it is a *Memory*, and Representation of the true *Sacrifice*, and *holy Oblation* made on the Altar of the *Cross*. *Archib. Cranmer in his Answer to Bishop Gardiner concerning the most holy Sacrament, L. 5. p. 377.* And again, this shortly is the minde of *Lombardus*, That the thing which is done at Gods Board is a *Sacrifice*, and so is that also which was made upon the *Cross*, but not after one manner of understanding: For this was the *Thing* indeed, and that is the *Commemoration* of the *thing*. *Ibid.* So likewise *Bishop Jewel* acknowledgeth *invenitum & rationabile Sacrificium*, spoken of by *Euseb. de Demonstrat. Euzang. L. 1.* *Jewel's Reply against Hardinge. Art. 7. Divis. 9.* Again, the ministracion of the holy *Communion* is sometimes of the Ancient Fathers called an *unbloody Sacrifice*, not in respect of any *Corporal* or *Fleshy* presence, that is imagined to be there without bloudshedding, but for that it representeth, and reporteth to our mindes that one, and everlasting *Sacrifice* that *Christ* made in his *Body* upon the *Cross*. This *Bishop Jewel* disliketh not in his *Answer to Harding*, *Art. 17. Divis. 14.* *Patres Canam Dominicam duplice de causa vocant Sacrificium inveniuntum. Tum quia sit Imago & solensis representatio illius Sacrificii Ihesus quod Christus cum sanguinis effusione obtulit in Cruce: Tum quid sit etiam Eucharisticum Sacrificium, id est, Sacrificium Laudis & gratiarum actionis, cetero pro beneficiis omnibus, tamen pro redemptio imprimis per Christi mortem perfacta.* *Zanch. in 2 Præcept. Decal. E. 4. p. 459.* And *D. Pule* also acknowledges a *Sacrifice* in the *Eucharist*. In *S. Matth. 26.26. Non dissimilavint Christiani in Cana Domini, sed ut ipsi laquebatur, in Sacrificio Altaris peculiariter quoniam modo presentem se venerari Deum Christianorum*, *(ed que esse forma eius Sacrificii quod per Symbola Panis & Vini peragitur, hoc Vtives præ se non ferrebat.* *M. Casaub. Exercit. 16. ad Annal. Baroz. S. 43. p. 560.*

* In the Liturgie of the Church of England we pray to God immediately after the reception of the *Sacrament*: That he would be pleased to accept this our *Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving*, &c. And *Heb. 13.15.* The *Sacrifice Propitiatory* was made by *Christ* himself onely, but the *Sacrifice Commemorative* and *Gratulatory* is made by the *Priest* and the *People*. *Archibishop Cranmer in his Answer to Bishop Gardiner, L. 5. p. 377.*

Christ.

¶ I beseech you Brethren by the mercies of God, that you give up your Bodies a living Sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God, Rom. 12.1. We offer, and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living Sacrifice unto thee. So the Church of England in the Prayer after the receiving of the Blessed Sacrament.

serve him in both, all the rest of his life, for this blessing thus bestowed on him. Now thus sat these dissenting Churches agree, that in the *Eucharist*, there is a Sacrifice of *Duty*, and a Sacrifice of *Praise*, and a Sacrifice of *Commemoration* of Christ. Therefore according to the former Rule, (and here in truth too) 'tis safest for a man to believe the Commemorative, the Praising, and the Performing Sacrifice, and to offer them duly to God, and leave the *Church of Rome* in this Particular to her *Superstitions*, that I may say no more. And would the *Church of Rome* stand to A.C.'s Rule, and believe dissenting Parties where they agree, were it but in this, and that before, of the *Real presence*, it would work far toward the *Peace of Christendom*. But the *Truth* is, They pretend the *Peace of Christendom*, but care no more for it, than as it may uphold at least, if not increase their own *Greatness*.

Punct. 4. My fourth Instance shall be in the *Sacrament of Baptism*, and the things required as *necessary* to make it effectual to the Receiver. They in the common received Doctrine of the *Church of Rome* are three. The *Matter*, the *Form*, and the *Intention* of the Priest, to do that which the *Church* doth, and intends he should do. Now all other *Divines*, as well *ancient* as *modern*, and both the *dissenting Churches* also, agree in the two former; but many deny that the *Intention* of the Priest is necessary. Will A.C. hold his *Rule*, That 'tis safest to believe in a controverted Point of Faith that which the dissenting Parties agree on, or which the Adverse Part Confesses? If he will not, then why should he press that, as a *Rule* to direct others, which he will not be guided by himself? And if he will, then he must go professedly against the * *Council of Trent*, which hath determined it as *deside*, as a Point of Faith, that the *Intention* of the Priest is necessary to make the *Baptism* true and valid. Though in the || *History* of that *Council*, 'tis most apparent the *Bishops* and other *Divines* there could not tell what to answer to the *Bishop of Minors, a Neapolitan*, who declared his Judgement openly against it, in the face of that *Council*.

Punct. 5. My fifth Instance is: We say, and can easily prove there are divers Errors, and some gross ones, in the *Roman Missal*. But I my self have heard some *Jesuites* confess, that in the *Liturgy of the Church of England* there's no positive Error. And being pressed, why then they refused to come to our Churches, and serve God with us? They answered, they could not do it, Because though our *Liturgy* had in it nothing ill, yet it wanted

Christ. The *Third*, + by every particular man for himself only; and that is the Sacrifice of every mans Body, and Soul, to

wanted a great deal of that which was good, and was in their service. Now here let A. C. consider again, Here is a plain *Concession of the adverse Part*: And both agree, there's nothing in our service, but that which is *holy and good*. What will the Jesuite or A. C. say to this? If he forsake his ground, then it is not safest in point of Divine Worship to joyn in Faith as the dissenting Parties agree, or to stand to the Adversaries own Confession. If he be so hardy as to maintain it, then the *English Liturgy* is *better*, and *safer* to worship God by, than the *Roman Miss.* Which yet, I presume A. C. will not confess.

In all these *Instances* (the Matter so falling out of it self, for N U M. 8. the Argument enforces it not) *the thing is true; but not therefore true, because the dissenting Parties agree in it*, or because the adverse Part Confesses it. Yet left the Jesuite, or A. C. for him, farther to deceive the weak, should infer that this *Rule* in so many Instances is true, and false in none, but that one concerning *Baptism* among the *Donatists*, and therefore the Argument is true *ut plerumq;*, as for the most, and that therefore 'tis the safest way to believe that which dissenting Parties agree on; I will lay down some other *Particulars* of as great Consequence, as any can be in, or about *Christian Religion*. And if in them A. C. or any Jesuite dare say, that 'tis safest to believe as the dissenting Parties agree, or as the adverse Party confesses, I dare say he shall be an *Heretick* in the highest degree, if not an *Infidel*.

And *First*, where the Question was betwixt the *Orthodox*, Punct. I. and the *Arrian*, whether the Son of God were *consubstantial* with the *Father*. The *Orthodox* said he was *in unio* of the *same substance*. The *Arrian* came within in a *Letter of the Truth*, and said he was *in union* of *like substance*. Now he that says, he is of the same substance, confesses he is of like substance, and more, that is, *Identity of Substance*; for *Identity* contains in it all Degrees of likeness, and more. But he that acknowledges, and believes that He is of like nature, and no more, denies the *Identity*: Therefore if this *Rule* be true, *That it is safest to believe that, in which the dissenting Parties agree, or which the Adverse Part Confesses*, (which A. C. makes such great vaunt of) then 'tis safest for a *Christian* to believe that Christ is of like nature with *God the Father*, and be free from Belief, that He is *Consustantial* with him; which yet is Concluded by the **Council of Nice* as necessary to *Salvation*, and the Contrary Condemned for *Damnable Heresy*.

Secondly, in the Question about the *Resurrection*, between Punct. 2. the *Orthodox*, and diverse Cross + Heretics of old, and the *Anabaptists* and *Libertines* of late. For all, or most of these dissenting Parties agree, that

D d

+ *Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Valentius, Cerdon, Appelles, &c.* Tertull. ad prescript. adverf. Harr. c. 46, 48, 49, 51; &c.

there

there ought to be a *Resurrection* from sin to a state of *Grace*, and that this *Resurrection* only is meant in divers Passages of *holy Scripture*.

* *Libertini* ridens genitum quoniam de *Resurrectione* habemus, idque jam nobis rovissi dicunt, quod adhuc expectamus, &c. ut Homo sit *Animam suam Spiritum immortalis esse perpetuo viventem in Celis*, &c. *Catech.* infrautram adiutio, *Libertinos*, c. 22. p. 116. *Sunt etiam hodie Libertini qui eam trident, & Resurrectionem quae traditur in Scripturis, tantum ad animas referrunt.* Pet. Mart. *Loc. Com.* class. 2. ca. 15. Nu. 4.

picture, together with the *Life of the Soul*, which they are content to say is *Immortal*. But * they utterly deny any *Resurrection of the Body after Death*: So with them that *Article of the Creed* is gone. Now then if any man will guide his Faith by this Rule of *A. C.* The *Consent of dissenting Parties*, or the *Confession of the Adverse Part*, he must deny the *Resurrection of the Body* from the *Grave to Glory*, and believe none but that of the *Soul*, from *sin to Grace*, which the *Adversaries Confess*, and in which the *Dissenting Parties agree*.

Punct. 3. Thirdly, in the great *Dispute* of all others, about the *Unity of the Godhead*. All dissenting Parties, *Jew*, *Turk*, and *Christian*: Among Christians *Orthodox*, and *Anti-Trinitarian* of old: And in these later times, *Orthodox* and *Socinian* (that Horrid and mighty Monster of all *Heresies*) agree in this, That there is but *one God*. And I hope it is as necessary to believe *one God our Father*, as *one Church our Mother*. Now will *A. C.* say here, 'tis safest believing as the *dissenting Parties agree*, or as the *Adverse Parties Confess*, namely, That there is but *one God*, and so deny the *Trinity*, and therewith the *Son of God the Saviour of the world*?

Punct. 4. Fourthly, in a *Point* as *Fundamental in the Faith*, as this, *¶ Hebr. 11. 37. Cyrilus Alexandrinus mali audivit, quod Ammonius martyrem appellavit, quia confitit uarietatis peccata dedit, & non Necesse negandi Christi in tormentis esse numerum. Socr. Hist. Eccl. L. 7. c. 14.*

Man; for so our *Creed* teaches us: And all those *Heretics*, which affirm *Christ* to be *Man*, but deny him to be *God*, as the ^b *Arrians*, and ^c *Carpocratians*, and ^d *Cerinthians*, and ^e *Hebion*, with others: and at this day the ^f *Socinians*. These *dissenting Parties* agree fully and clearly, That *Christ* is *Man*.

Well then. Dare *A. C.* stick to his *Rule* here, and say, 'tis safest for a *Christian* in this great *Point of Faith* to govern his Belief by the ^g *Consent of these dissenting Parties*, or the *Confession and acknowledgment of the Adverse Party*, and so settle his Belief, that *Christ* is a meer *Man*, and not *God*? I hope he dares not. So then, this *Rule*, *To Resolve a mans Faith into that, in which the Dissenting Parties agree, or which the Adverse Part confesses*, is as often false, as true. And false in as Great, if not Greater Matters, than those, in which it is true.

And

And where 'tis true, A.C. and his fellows dare not govern themselves by it, the *Church of Rome* condemning those things which that *Rule* proves. And yet while they talk of *Certainty*, nay of *Infallibility*, (lest will not serve their turns) they are driven to make use of such poor shifts as these, which have no *certainty* at all of Truth in them, but infer falsehood and Truth alike. And yet for this also men will be so weak, or so wilful, as to be seduced by them.

I told you * before, That the force of the preceding Argument lies upon two things. The one expressed, and that's past; the other upon the Bye, which comes now to be handled. And that is your continual poor Out-cry against us, *That we cannot be saved, because we are out of the Church.* Sure if I thought I were out, I would get in as fast as I could. For we confess as well as you, That ^t *Out of the Catholike Church of Christ there is no Salvation.* But what do you mean by *Out of the Church?* Sure out of the || *Roman Church.* Why but the *Roman Church* and the *Church of England* are but two distinct Members of that *Catholike Church* which is spread over the face of the Earth. Therefore *Rome* is not the House where the *Church* dwells, but *Rome* it self, as well as other particular Churches, dwells in this great *Universal House*; unless you will shut up the *Church* in *Rome*, as the *Donatists* did in *Africk*. I come a little lower.

Rome and other National Churches are in this Universal Catholike House as so many * Daughters, to whom (under Christ) the care of the Household is committed by God the Father, and the Catholike Church the Mother of all Christians. **Rome**, as an Elder Sister,† but not the Eldest neither, came thence to settle One at **Rome**. Nor is it an Opinion destitute either of Authority, or Probability, That the Faith of Christ was preached, and the Sacraments administered here in **England**, before any settlement of a Church in **Rome**. For S. Gildas the Ancientest monument we have, and whom the Romanists themselves reverence, says expressly, That the Religion of Christ was received in **Brittany**, *Tempore C. I. scimus summo Tiberii Caesaris, &c.* In the latter time of **Tiberius Caesar**, Gildas de cœsid. Brit. whereas S. Peter kept in **Jewry** long after **Tiberius** his death. Therefore the first Conversion of this Island to the **Faith**, was not by S. Peter. Nor from **Rome**, which was then a Church. Against this Rich. Broughton in his Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, Centur. I.C.8. §.4. says expressly : *That the Protestants do freely acknowledge, that this Clause of the time of Tiberius (tempore summo Tiberii Caesaris) is wanting in other Copies of that holy Writer, and namely in that which was set forth by Pol. Virgil, and others. Whereas first these words are express in a most fair, and ancient Manuscript of Gildas to be seen in Sir Rob. Cotton's Study, if any doubt it. Secondly, these words are as express in the printed Edition of Gildas by Polyd. Virg. which Edition was printed at London, An. 1525. and was never reprinted since. Thirdly, these words are as express in the Edition of Gildas, by Jo. Joachin. printed at London also , An. 1568. And this falsehood of Broughton is so much the more foul, because he boasts (Prefat. to his Reader, fine.) *That he hath seen, and diligently perused the most, and best Monuments and Antiquities extant, &c.* For if he did not see and peruse these, he is vainly false to say it : if he did see them, he is most maliciously false to belie them. And Lastly, whereas he says : *The Protestants themselves confess so much, I must believe he is as false in this as in the former, till he name the Protestants to me, which do confess it.* And when he doth, he shall gain but this from me, *That those Protestants which confessed it, were mistaken. For the thing is mistaken.**

D d 2

had

had a great Care committed unto her, in, and from the prime times of the Church, and to her *Bishop* in her: but at this time (to let pass many brawls that have formerly been in the House) *England*, and some other *sisters* of hers are fallen out in the *Family*. What then? Will the *Father*, and the *Mother*, God, and the Church, cast one Childe out, because another is angry with it? Or when did Christ give that power to an *Elder Sister*, that She, and her *steward*, the *Bishop* there, should thrust out what Childe she pleased? Especially when she her self is justly accused to have given the Offence that is taken in the House? Or will not both *Father*, and *Mother* be sharper to Her for this unjust and unnatural usage of her younger *sisters*, but their dear Children? Nay, is it not the next way to make them turn her out of doors, that is so unnatural to the rest? It is well for all Christian Men and Churches, that the *Father* and *Mother* of them are not so curst as some would have them. And Salvation need not be feared of any dutiful Childe, nor Outing from the Church, because this *Elder Sisters* faults are discovered in the House, and she grown froward for it against them that complained. But as Children cry when they are waked out of sleep, so do you, and wrangle with all that come neer you.

* Returns of untruths upon M. Jewel. Art. 4. Untruth 105.
And * Stapleton confesses, That ye were

† For I am sure there is a Roman Church, that is but a Particular. Bellarm. L. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 4. And then you must either shew me another Roman Church, which is *The Catholike*: Or you must shew how One and the same Roman Church is in different Respects or Relations *A Particular*, and yet *The Catholike*. Which is not yet done. And I do not say, *A Particular*, and yet *A Catholike*; But *A Particular*, and yet *The Catholike Church*: For so you speak. For that which card. *Petros* hath, That the *Roman Church* is the *Catholike* *Casually*, because it infuses Universality into all the whole Body of the Catholike Church, can, I think, satisfie no man that reads it. That a Particular should infuse Universality into an Universal. Petron. L. 4. of his Reply. c. 9.

F. The Lady which doubted (said the Bishop to me) may be better saved in it, than you.

§. 36. B. I said so indeed. *Mark that too.* Where yet by the way, these words (*Than you*) do not suppose Person only. For I will * Rom. 14. Judge *no man, that hath another Master to stand or fall to*. But they suppose *Calling* and *Sufficiency* in the Person. *Than you*, that is, *Than any man of your Calling and Knowledge*, of whom more is required. And then no question of the truth of this speech, *That that person may better be saved (that is, easier) than you, than any man that knows so much of Truth, and op-*

poses against it, as you, and others of your Calling do. How far you know Truth, other men may judge by your Proofs, and Causes of Knowledge; but how far you oppole Ttuth known to you, that is within, and no man can know, but God and your selves. Howsoever, where the Foundation is but held, there for * ordinary men, it is not the vivacity of Understanding, but the simplicity of Believing, that makes them safe. For S. Augustine speaks there, of men in the Church; and no † man can be said simply to be Out of the Visible Church, that is Baptized, and holds the Foundation. And as it is the simplicity of Believing, that makes them safe, yea safest: so is it sometimes, A quickness of Understanding, that loving it self, and some by-respects too well, makes men take up an unsafe way about the Faith. So that there's no Question, but many were saved in corrupted times of the Church, when their || Leaders, unless they repented before death, were lost. And * S. Augustine's Rule will be true, That in all Corruptions of the Church, there will ever be a difference between an Heretick, and a plain well-meaning man that is misled, and believes an Heretick. Yet here let me adde this for fuller Expression: This must be understood of such Leaders and Hereticks as † refuse to hear the Churches Instruction, or to use all the means they can, to come to the knowledge of the Truth. For else, if they do this, Erre they may, but Hereticks they are not, as is most manifest in || S. Cyprian's Case of Re-baptization. For here, though he were a main Leader in that Errour, yet all the whole Church grant him safe; and his * Followers in danger of damnation. But if any man be a Leader, and a Teaching Heretick, and will adde † Schism to Herese, and be obstinate in both, he without Repentance must needs be lost, while many that succeed him in the Errour onely, without the Obstinacy, may be saved. For, they which are misled, and swayed with the Current of Time, hold the same Errours with their Misleaders, yet not supinely, but with all sober diligence to finde out the Truth: Not pertinaciously, but with all readiness to submit to Truth, so soon as it shall be found: Not uncharitably, but retaining an internal Communion with the

* Ceteram turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed Credendi simplicitas tutissimam habet. S. Aug. cont. Fund. c. 4.

Eccl. Doctrina. ¶ Nada et dico.

vixit. Naz. Orat. 21.

Omission of Inquiry many times saves the people.

† Hereticks in respect of the Profession of sundry Divine Verities which they still retain in common with right Believers, &c. do still pertain to the Church. Field, L.1. de Eccles. c. 14. Potest aliquis Ecclesi membrum esse secundum quid, qui carmen simpliciter non est. Hereticus recidens à Fide, non dimittitur ab Paganiis, sed propter Baptismi characterem, paucior ut transfigura, & Excommunicatione gladio spiritualiter occiditur. Stapl. Controv. 1. q. 2. A. 3. Nosabil. 3.

The Apostle pronounces some gone out, S. Job. 2.19. from the fellowship of sound Believers, when as yet the Christian Religion they had not utterly cast off. In like sense and meaning, throughout all Ages, Hereticks have justly been hated, as branches cut off from the true Vine, yet only so far forth cut off, as the Heresies have extended. For both Heresie, and many other Crimes which wholly sever from God, do sever stoin the Church of God, but in part only. Hooker, L.5. Eccles. Pol. § 68.

|| Ipsa Magistris perentibus: nisi forte ante mortem respergunt. Luth. de Serv. Arbit.

Hereticks plus peccant, quam alii qui Hereticki aliquam sunt secuti. Suppl. Tho. q.99. A.4. c.

* Si vobis videbetur unus & idem Hereticus, & Hereticki credens homo, &c. S. Aug. L.1. de Will. Cred. c.1. Et Epist. 162. ad Donatist. Episc.

† Mat. 18.17. Qui oppugnat Regulam Veritatis. S. Aug. L. de Heretibus: versus suem.

|| Cyprianus Abatus, & Martyr. S. Aug. L.1. de Bapt. cont. Donat. c.18.

* Donatista veri (qui de Cypriani Autoritate sibi carnaliter blandiuntur, S. Aug. L.1. de Bapt. cont. Donat. c.18.) nimium miseri, & nisi se corrigant, & semper omnia damnati, qui hoc in tanto erro eligunt imitari. Ibid.c.19.

† Rel. salutaris (cœrci accusatum Cicianum) reprehensi Donatista, pertinaci dissentio firmata, Schisma in Heresia verterunt. S. Aug. L. de Heret. Her.69. Et Tales, sub Vocabulo Christiano doctrina refutant Christiana. S. Aug. L.2. de Civ. Dñi. c.52. prin.

Whole

Whole Visible Church of Christ in the Fundamental Points of Faith, and performance of acts of Charity, not *facionis*, but with an earnest desire, and a sincere endeavour (as their Place and Calling gives them means) for a perfect Union, and Communion of all Christians in *Truth*, as well as *Peace*. I say these, however misled, are neither *Hereticks*, nor *Schismaticks* in the sight of God, and are therefore in a state of Salvation. And were not this true *Divinity*, it would go very hard with many poor Christian souls, that have been, and are misled on all sides in these and other *Distracted times* of the Church of Christ; Whereas thus habituated in themselves, they are, by God's mercy, safe in the midst of those waves, in which their *Misseaders* perish. I pray you *Mark this*, and so, by God's Grace, will I. For our * Reckoning will be heavier, if we thus mislead on either side, than theirs that follow us. But I see I must look to my self; for you are secure: For,

* *Qui si ipsi polmolum ad Ecclesiam reducunt, restituere tamen eos, & secum re-vocare non possunt, qui ab illis seducti sunt, & faro morte preventi extra Ecclesiam sive communicationem & Pace perierunt, quorum Anima in die Iudicii de ipsorum manibus expertentur, qui perditionis Autores, & ducis existentur. S.Cypt. L.2. Epist. 1.*

F. D. White (said I) hath secured me, that none of our Errors be damnable, so long as we hold them not against our Conscience. And I hold none against my Conscience.

§. 37. B. It seems then you have two Securities: D. White's Assertion, and your Conscience. What Assurance D. White gave you, I cannot tell of my self; nor, as things stand, may I rest upon your Relation. It may be you use him no better than you do me. And sure it is so. For I have since spoken with D. White the late Reverend Bishop of Ely, and he avows this, and no other Answer. He was asked in the Conference between you, Whether Popish Errors were Fundamental? To this he gave an Answer, by distinction of the Persons which held and professed the Errors: Namely, that the Errors were Fundamental reductive, by a Reducement, if they which embraced them did pertinaciously adhere to them, having sufficient means to be better informed: Nay farther, that they were materially, and in the very Kinde and ^{+ Cor. 3.12.} Nature of them, Leaven, Dross, + Hay, and Stubble. Yet he thought withal, that such as were misled by Education, or long Custom, or over-valuing the Sovereignty of the Romane Church, and did in simplicity of heart embrace them, might by their general Repentance, and Faith in the Merit of Christ, attended with Charity, and other Virtues, finde mercy at God's hands. But that he should say signanter, and expressly, That none either of yours, or your Fellows Errors were damnable, so long as you hold them not against Conscience, that he utterly disavows. You delivered nothing to extort such a Confession from him. And for your self,

be

he could observe but small love of Truth, few signes of Grace in you (as he told me;) Yet he will not presume to judge you, or your Salvation; It is the Word of Christ that must judge you at *S.Joh.12.48 the later day. For your Conscience, you are the happier in your Errour, that you hold nothing against it, especially if you speak not against it, while you say so. But this no man can know, but your self: † For no man knows the thoughts of a man, but the spirit of a man that is within him; to which I leave you. ‡ 1 Cor.2.11.

To this A.C. replies, And first he grants, that D. White did N U M. 2. not signanter and expressly say these precise words. So then here's A. C. p. 67. his plain Confession: Not these precise words. Secondly he saith, that neither did D. White signanter and expressly make the Answer above mentioned. But to this I can make no Answer, since I was not present at the first or second Conference. Thirdly, he saith, that the Reason which moved the Jesuite to say D. White had secured him, was because the said Doctor had granted in his first Conference with the Jesuite these things following. First, That there must be one or other Church continually visible. Though D. White, late Bishop of Ely, was more able to Answer for himself; yet since he is now dead, and is thus drawn into this Discourse, I shall, as well as I can, do him the right, which his Learning, and Pains for the Church deserved. And to this first, I grant as well as he, That there must be some one Church or other continually visible: Or that the Militant Church of Christ must always be visible in some Particulars, or Particular at least (Express it as you please.) For if this be not so, then there may be a time in which there shall not any where be a Visible Profession of the Name of Christ; which is contrary to the whole scope and promise of the Gospel.

Well. What then? Why then A. C. addes, That D. White N U M. 3. confessed that this Visible Church had in all Ages taught that un- A. C. p. 67. changed Faith of Christ in all Points Fundamental. D. White had reason to say that the Visible Church taught so; but that this or that particular Visible Church did so teach, sure D. White affirmed not; unless in case the whole Visible Church of Christ were reduced to one Particular only.

But suppose this. What then? Why then A.C. tells us, that N U M. 4. D. White being urged to assigne such a Church, expressly granted A. C. p. 67. he could assigne one different from the Romane, which held in all Ages all points Fundamental. Now here I would fain know what A.C. means by a Church different from the Romane. For if he mean different in place; Tis easie to affirm the Greek Church (which as hath † before been proved) hath ever held, and taught the Foundation in the midst of all her Pressures. And if he mean different in Doctrinal things, and those about the Faith, he cannot assigne the Church of Rome for holding them in all Ages. But if he mean different in the Foundation it self, the Creed;

*Ep. 21. fol. 2**
Creed; then his urging to affigne a Church, is void, be it Rome, or any other. For if any other Church shall thus differ from Rome, or Rome from it self, as to deny this Foundation, it doth not, it cannot remain a Differing Church, sed transi in Non Ecclesiam, but paffes away into No Church, upon the Denial of the Creed.

NUM. 5.

*A. C. p. 67.**A. C. p. 67.*

Now what *A. C.* means, he expresses not, nor can I tell; but I may peradventure guess near it, by that which out of these Premises he would infer. For hence he tells us, *He gathered that D. White's Opinion was, That the Romane Church held and taught in all Ages unchanged Faith in all Fundamental points, and did not in any Age erre in any Point Fundamental.* This is very well. For *A. C.* confesses, he did but gather, that this was Doctor *White's* Opinion. And what if he gathered that, which grew not there, nor thence? For suppose all the Premises true, yet no Cartrope can draw this Conclusion out of them. And then all *A. C.*'s labour's lost. For grant some one Church or other must still be Visible: And grant that this Visible Church held all Fundamentals of the Faith in all Ages. And grant again, that *D. White* could not affigne any Church differing from the *Romane*, that did this; Yet this will not follow, that therefore the *Romane* did it. And that because there's more in the Conclusion, than in the Premises. For *A. C.*'s Conclusion is, *That in D. White's Opinion the Roman Church held and taught in all Ages unchanged Faith in all Fundamental points.* And so far perhaps the Conclusion may stand, taking Fundamental points in their literal sense, as they are expressed in *Creeds*, and approved *Councils*. But then he addes: *And did not in any Age erre in any Point Fundamental.* Now this can never follow out of the Premises before laid down. For say some one Church or other may still be Visible; And that Visible Church hold all Fundamental Points in all Ages; And no man be able to name another Church different from the *Church of Rome*, that hath done this; yet it follows not therefore, *That the Church of Rome did not erre in any Age in any Point Fundamental.* For a Church may hold the Fundamental Point literally, and as long as it stays there, be without control; and yet erre grossly, dangerously, nay damnably in the *Exposition* of it. And this is the *Church of Rome's Case*. For most true it is, it hath in all Ages maintained the Faith unchanged in the Expression of the *Articles* themselves; but it hath in the *Exposition* both of *Creeds*, and *Councils*, quite changed, and lost the sense, and the meaning of some of them. So the *Faith* is in many things *Changed* both for Life and Belief, and yet seems the same. Now that which deceives the World, is, That because the *Bark* is the same, men think this Old Decayed Tree, is as Sound as it was at first, and not Weather-beaten in any Age. But when they can

can make me believe that Painting is true Beauty, I'll believe too, that Rome is not only sound, but beautiful.

But A.C. goes on and tells us, That hereupon the Jesuite asked, NUM. 6.
A.C. p.67.
whether Errors in Points not Fundamental were damnable? And that D. White answered, they were not, unless they were held against Conscience. Tis true, that Error in Points not Fundamental is the more damnable, the more it is held against Conscience: But it is true too, that Error in Points not Fundamental may be damnable to some men, though they hold it not against their Conscience. As namely, when they hold an Error in some Dangerous Points, which grate upon the Foundation, and yet will neither seek the means to know the Truth, nor accept and believe Truth when 'tis known, especially being men able to Judge; which I fear, is the case of too many at this day in the Roman Church. Out of all which A.C. tells us, A.C. p.68.
The Jesuite collected, that D. White's Opinion was, That the Roman Church held all Points Fundamental, and only erred in Points not Fundamental, which he accounted not damnable so long as he did not hold them against his Conscience; And that thereupon he said D. White had secured him, since he held no Faith different from the Roman, nor contrary to his Conscience. Here again, we have but A.C.'s and the Jesuites Collection: But if the Jesuite, or A.C. will collect amiss, who can help it?

I have spoken before in this very Paragraph to all the Passages of A.C. as supposing them true: and set down what is to be answered to them, in case they prove so. But now 'tis most apparent by Dr. White's Answer, set down before † at large, that he never said, that the Church of Rome erred only in Points not Fundamental, as A.C. would have it. But that he said the contrary, Namely, that some errors of thy Church were Fundamental reductive, by a reducement, if they which embraced them, did pertinaciously adhere to them, having sufficient means of information: And again expressly, That he did not say, that none were damnable, so long as they were not held against Conscience. Now where is A.C.'s Collection? For if a Jesuite, or any other may collect Propositions, which are not granted him; nay, contrary to those which are granted him, he may infer what he please. And he is much to blame, that will not infer a strong Conclusion for himself, that may frame his own Premises, say his Adversary what he will. And just so doth A.C. bring in his Conclusion, to secure himself of salvation, because he holds no Faith but the Romane, nor that Contrary to his Conscience: Presupposing it granted, that the Church of Rome errs only in not Fundamentals, and such Errors not Damnable, which is absolutely and clearly denied by D. White. To this A.C. says A.C. p.67.
nothing, but that D. White did not give this Answer at the Conference. I was not present at the Conference between them,

so, to that I can say nothing as a witness. But I think all that knew D. White, will believe his affirmation as soon as the *Jesuit*. To say no more. And whereas A.C. refers to the Relation of the Conference between D. White and M. Fisher, most true it is, there * D. White is charged to have made that Answer twice. But all this rests upon the credit of A.C. only (For † he is said to have made that Relation too, as well as this.) And against his Credit I must engage D. White, who hath avowed another Answer, as || before is let down.

A.C. p. 67.
* A.C. in his
relation of
that Confe-
rence, p. 26.
† For so 'tis
said in the Ti-
tle-page, by
A.C.

|| S. 37. N. 1.
NUM. 8.

- And since A.C. relates to that Conference, which it seems he makes some good account of, I shall here once for all take occasion to assure the Reader, That most of the Points of Moment in that Conference with D. White, are repeated again and again, and urged in this Conference, or the Relation of A.C. and are here answered by me. For Instance: In the Relation of the (1) first Conference, the Jesuite takes on him to prove the Unwritten Word of God out of 2 Thes. 2. pag. 15. And so he doth in the Relation of this Conference with me, pag. 50. In the first he stands upon it, *That the Protestants upon their Principles cannot hold, That all Fundamental points of Faith are contained in the Creed*, pag. 19. And so he doth in this, pag. 46. In the first, he would fain through Master Roger's sides wound the Church of England, as if she were unsettled in the Article of Christ's Descent into Hell, pag. 21. And he endeavours the same in this, pag. 46. In the first he is very earnest to prove, *That the Schism was made by the Protestants*, pag. 23. And he is as earnest for it in this, pag. 55. In the first he lays it for a Ground, *That Corruption of Manners is no just Cause of separation from Faith, or Church*, pag. 24. And the same Ground he lays in this, pag. 55. In the first he will have it, *That the Holy Ghost gives continual, and Infallible Assurance to the Church*, pag. 24. And just so will he have it in this, pag. 53. In the first he makes much ado about the Erring of the Greek Church, pag. 28. And as much makes he in this, pag. 44. In the first, he makes a great noyse about the place in St. Augustine, *Ferendus est disputator errans, &c.* pag. 18. and 24. And so doth he here also, pag. 45. In the first, he would make his Proselytes believe, That he and his Cause have mighty advantage by that Sentence of S. Bernard, *Tis intolerable Pride:* And that of S. Augustini, *The insolent madness to oppose the Doctrine, or Practice of the Catholike Church*, pag. 25. And twice he is at the same Art in this, pag. 56. and 73. In the first, he tells us, That * Calvin confesses, *That in the Reformation, there was a Departure from the whole world*, pag. 25. And though I conceive Calvin spake this but of the Roman world, and of no Voluntary, but a forced Departure, and wrote this to Melancthon, to work Unity among the Reformers, not any way

* Postquam dis-
cessione tota
mundo facere
coactum sumus.
Calv. Epist.
141.

(ii)

to blast the *Reformation*: Yet we must hear of it again in this, pag. 56. But over and above the rest, one Place with his own *gloss* upon it pleases him extreamly, 'Tis out of S. Athanasius his Creed. *That whosoever doth not hold it entire, that is, (faith he) in all Points: and Inviolate; that is, (faith he) in the true unchanged, and uncorrupted sense proposed unto us by the Pastors of his Catholike Church, without doubt he shall perish everlastingily.* This he hath almost *verbatim* in the first, page 20. And in the Epistle of the Publisher of that Relation to the Reader, under the Name of *W. I.* and then again the very same in this, if not with some more disadvantage to himself, page 70. And perhaps (had I leisure to search after them) more Points than these. Now the Reasons which moved me to set down these *Particulars* thus distinctly, are two. The One, that whereas the * *Jesuite* affirms, that in a *second Conference* all the speech was about Particular matters, and little or nothing about the main, and great general Point of a *Continual, Infallible, Visible Church*, in which that Lady required satisfaction, and that therefore this *third Conference* was held; It may hereby appear that the most material, both Points, and Proofs are upon the matter the very same in all the *three Conferences*, though little be related of the *second Conference* by *A. C.* as appears in the Preface of the Publisher *W.I.* to the Reader. So this tends to nothing but *Ostentation*, and shew. The Other is, that Whereas these men boast so much of their Cause and their Ability to defend it; It cannot but appear by this, and their handling of other Points in *Divinity*, that they labour indeed, but no otherwise, then like an *Horse in a Mill*; round about in the same Circle; no farther at *night* then at *noon*; The same thing over and over again; from *Tu es Petrus*, to *Pascè oves*; from thou art *Peter*, to Do thou feed my Sheep; And back again the same way.

* In the beginning of the Conference set out by A. C.

F. The Lady asked, Whether she might be saved in the Protestant Faith? Upon my soul (said the Bishop) you may. Upon my soul (said I,) there is but one saving Faith, and that is the Roman.

B. So (it seems) I was confident for the Faith professed in the Church of England, else I would not have taken the salvation of another upon my soul. And sure I had reason of this my Confidence. For to believe the *Scripture*, and the *Creeds*; to believe these in the sense of the Ancient Primitive Church; To receive the four great *General Councils*, so much magnified by Antiquity; To believe all Points of Doctrine, generally received as Fundamental in the *Church of Christ*, is a *Faith*, in which to live and die, cannot but give salvation. And there-

§. 38.

NUM. I

fore I went upon a sure ground in the adventure of my soul upon that *Faith*. Besides, in all the Points of Doctrine that are controverted between us, I would fain see any one Point maintained by the *Church of England*, that can be proved to depart from the *Foundation*. You have many dangerous Errours about the very *Foundation*, in that which you call the *Roman Faith*: But there I leave you to look to your own soul, and theirs whom you seduce. Yet this is true too, That there is but one *saving Faith*. But then every thing which you call *De Fide, of the Faith*, because some *Council* or other hath defined it, is not such a Breach from that *One saving Faith*, as that he which expressly believes it not; nay, as that he which believes the Contrary, is excluded from Salvation, so his + *Disobedience* therewhile offer no violence to the *Peace* of the *Church*, nor the *Charity*, which ought to be among *Christians*. And + *Bellarmino* is forced to grant this, *There are many things de Fide, which are not absolutely necessary to salvation*.

|| Therefore there is a *Latitude* in the *Faith*, especially in reference to different mens *salvation*. To set * Bounds to this, and strictly to define it for particular men, *Just thus far* you must believe in every Particular, or incur *damnation*, is no work for my *Pen*. These two things I am sure of. One, That your peremptory establishing of so many things, that are remote Deductions from the *Foundation*, to be believed as Matters of *Faith* necessary to *Salvation*, hath, with other Errours, lost the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *Church*, for which you will one day Answer. And the other, That you of *Rome* are gone farther from the *Foundation* of this *One saving Faith*, than can ever be proved, we of the *Church of England* have done.

N U m. 2.

A.C. p. 68.

But here *A.C.* bestirs himself, finding that he is come upon the Point, which is indeed most considerable. And first he

answers, *That it is * not sufficient to beget a Confidence in this Case, to say we believe the Scriptures and the Creeds, in the same sense which the Ancient Primitive Church believed them, &c.* Most true, if we onely say, and do not believe. And let them which believe not, while they say they do, look to it on all sides; for on all sides I doubt not, but such there are. But if we do say it, you are bound in *Charity* to believe us, (unless you can prove the Contrary) For I know no other proof to men of any Point of *Faith*, but *Confession* of it, and *Subscription* to it. And for these particulars, we have made the one, and done the other. So 'tis no bare saying, but you have all the proof that can be had, or

* Pope *Pelagius* the second thought it was sufficient. For when the *Bishop* of *Istria* deserted his *Communion* in *Causa trium Capitulorum*: He first gives them an Account of his *Faith*, that he embraced that *Faith*, which the *Apostles* had delivered, and the *four Synods* explicated. And then he adds: *ubi ergo de Fidei firmitate nulla vobis poterit questo, vel suspicio generari, &c. concil. To. 4. p. 473. Edit. Paris.* So then, that Pope thought there could be no question made, or suspicion had of any mans *faith*, that professed that *Faith*, which the *Apostles* delivered, as 'tis explicated by those Great *Councils*. And yet now with *A.C.* 'tis not sufficient. Or else he holds the *Faith* of our Lord *Jesus Christ* in such respect of persons (contrary to the *Apostles Rule*, *S. James* 2. 12.) as that profession of it, which was sufficient for *Pope Pelagius*, shall not be sufficient for the poor *Protestants*.

that

that ever any Church required : For how far that Belief, or any other, sinks into a mans heart, is for none to judge but God.

Next, A. C. Answers, *That if to say this be a sufficient Cause of Confidence, be marvels why I make such difficulty to be Confident of the Salvation of Romane Catholikes, who believe all this in a far better manner than Protestants do.* Truly, to say this, is not a sufficient cause, but to say and believe it, is. And to take off A. C's wonder why I make difficulty, great difficulty of the salvation of Romane Catholikes, who, he lays, believe all this, and in a far better manner than Protestants do ; I must be bold to tell him, That Romanists are so far from believing this in a better manner than we do, that, under favour, they believe not part of this at all. And this is most manifest : For the Romanists dare not believe, but as the Romane Church believes : And the Romane Church at this day doth not believe the Scripture and the Creeds in the sense, in the which the Ancient Primitive Church received them. For the Primitive Church never interpreted Christ's descent into Hell to be no lower than Limbus Patrum. Nor did it acknowledge a Purgatory in a side-part of Hell. Nor did it ever interpret away half the Sacrament from Christ's own Institution, which to break, + Stapleton confesses exprely, is a Damnable Error ; Nor make the Intention of the Priest of the Essence of Baptism ; Nor believe Worship due to Images ; Nor dream of a Transubstantiation, which the Learned of the Romane party dare not understand properly, for a change of one substance into another, for then they must grant that Christ's real and true Body is made of the Bread, and the Bread changed into it ; which is properly Transubstantiation. Nor yet can they express it in a credible way, as appears by * Bellarmine's Struggle about it, which yet in the end cannot be, or be

^{+ Stapl.Return of Untruths upon B. Jewel Art.2. Untruth 49. fol.44.}

unum Domini. Bellar. L.3. de Euchar. c.18. § 1. *Substantialis conversio, seu Transubstantio, sicut Ecclesia appellat.* Greg. de Valen. Tom. 4. Disp. 6. q.3. puer. 3. Now you shall see what stuff Bellarmine makes of this. *Conversio Panis in corpus Domini, nec eis Productiva, nec Conservativa, sed Adductiva.* Nam Corpus Domini preexistit ante Conversione, sed non sub speciebus Panis. *Conversio igitur non facit, ut Corpus Christi simpliciter esse incipiat, sed ut incipiat esse sub speciebus Panis, &c.* Bellarm. L.3. de Euchar. c.18. § Ex his colligimus. So upon the whole matter, there shall be a total Conversion of the Bread into the Body of Christ : And yet there shall be no Conversion at all, but a bringing of the Body of Christ before pre-existent, to be now under the species of Bread, where before it was not. Now this is merely Translocation, 'tis not Transubstantiation. And I would have Bellarmine, or any Jesuite for him, shew where *Conversio Adductiva* is read in any good Author. But when Bellarmine comes to the Recognition of his Works, upon this place he tells us, That some excepted against him, as if this were Translocation, rather than Transubstantiation. So in this charge upon him I am not alone. And fain would he shift off this, but it will not be. But while he is at it, he runs into two petty Errors, beside the main one. The first is, That the Body of Christ in the Sacrament begins to be, *non ut in loco, sed ut substantia sub Accidentibus.* Now let Bellarmine, or A. C. for him, give the any one Instance, That a Bodily substance under Accidents, is, or can be any where, and not *ut in loco*, as in some place, and he fays somewhat. The second is, That some Fathers and others seem (he fays, but I see it not) to approve of his manner of speech of Conversion by *Adductionem*. And he tells us for this, that Bonaventure says exprely, *In Transubstantiatione fit, ut quod erat alioqui, fit sui mutatione fit aliubi.* Now first, here's nothing that can be drawn with Cart-roopes to prove Conversion by *Adductionem*. For if there be Conversion, there must be Change : And this is *sine mutatione sui.* And secondly, I would fain know, how a Body that is *alioqui*, shall be *aliubi*, without change of it self, and yet that this shall be rather *Transubstantiation* than *Translocation*. Besides, 'tis a Phrase of very lowre Consequence (should a man squeeze it) which Bellarmine uses there even in his Recognition, *Panis transit in Corpus Christi.* called

called *Transubstantiation*, and is that, which at this day is a

* A Scandal, * scandal to both Jew and Gentile, and the Church of God.

and a grievous
one. For this gross Opinion was but Confirmed in the Council of *Latran*: It had got some footing in the Church, the two blinde Ages before. For *Berengarius* was made recant in such terms, as the *Romanists* are put to their shifts to excuse. *Bellar.* L.3. de Euchar. c.24. § Quartum Argumentum. For he says exprely: *corpus Christi posse in Sacramento sensu alterius manibus Sacerdotum tractari, & frangi, & fiduciam dentibus attiri.* *Dscr.* par.3. de *Consecratione.* Diff. 2. c. Ego *Berengarius.* Now this Recantation was made about the year 1050. And the Council of *Latran* was in the year 1215. Between this gross Recantation of *Berengarius*, and that Council, the great Learned Physician and Philosopher *Averroes* lived, and took scandal at the whole Body of Christian Religion for this. And thus he saith: *Mundum perigravi, &c. & non vidi Secundum dexterorem, aut magis fatum Christianam, quia Deum, quem colunt, dentibus devorant.* *Espencus* L.4. de Euchar. adoratione, c.3.

N II M. 4:
A.C. p. 69.

For all this, *A. C.* goes on, and tells us, That they (of Rome) cannot be proved to depart from the Foundation so much as Protestants do. So then, We have at last a *Confession* here, that they may be proved to depart from the Foundation, though not so much, or so far as the Protestants do. I do not mean to Answer this, and prove that the Romanists do depart as far, or farther from the Foundation, than the Protestants; for then *A.C.* would take me at the same lift, and say I granted a departure too. Briefly therefore, I have named here more Instances than one; In some of which they have erred in the Foundation, or very neer it. But for the *Church of England*, let *A. C.* instance, if he can, in any one Point, in which She hath departed from the Foundation.

A. C. p. 69.

Well, that *A. C.* will do: For he says, The Protestants erre against the Foundation, by denying infallible Authority to a General Council, for that is in effect to deny Infallibility to the whole Catholike Church. † No, there's a great deal of difference between a General Council, and the whole Body of the Church. Aud when a General Council erres, as the second of *Ephesus* did, out of that great Catholike Body another may be gathered, as was then that of *Chalcedon*, to do the Truth of Christ that right which belongs unto it. Now if it were all one in effect to say, a General Council can erre, and that the Whole Church can erre, there were no Remedy left against a General Council erring; || which is your Case now at *Rome*, and which hath thrust the Church of Christ into more straits than any one thing besides.

But I know where you would be. A General Council is Infallible, if it be confirmed by the Pope; and the Pope he is Infallible, else he could not make the Council so. And they which deny the Councils Infallibility, deny the Pope's which confirms it. And then indeed the Protestants depart a mighty way from this great Foundation of Faith, the Popes Infallibility. But God be thanked, this is onely from the Foundation of the present Romane Faith (as *A.C.* and the Jesuite call it) not from any Foundation of the Christian Faith, to which this Infallibility was ever a stranger.

A.C. p. 68.

N II M. 5.
From Anwering, *A. C.* falls to asking Questions. I think he means to try whether he can win any thing upon me, by the cunning way *A multis Interrogationibus simul*, by asking many things

things at once, to see if any one may make me slip into a Confession inconvenient. And first, he asks, How Protestants, admitting no Infallible Rule of Faith, but Scripture only, can be infallibly sure that they believe the same entire Scripture, and Creed, and the Four first General Councils, and in the same uncorrupted sense in which the Primitive Church believed? Tis just as I said. Here are many Questions in one, and I might easily be caught, would I answer in gross to them all together; but I shall go more distinctly to work. Well then; I admit no ordinary Rule left in the Church, of Divine and Infallible Verity, and so of Faith, but the *Scripture*. And I believe the entire Scripture, first by the *Tradition* of the Church; Then by all other credible Motives, as is before expressed: And last of all, by the light which shines in the Scripture it self, kindled in Believers by the *Spirit of God*. Then I believe the entire Scripture *Infallibly*, and by a *Divine Infallibility* am sure of my Object; Then am I as sure of my *Believing*, which is the *Act* of my *Faith*, conversant about this Object: For no man believes, but he must needs know in himself whether he *believes* or no, and wherein, and how far he doubts. Then I am Infallibly assured of my *Creed*, the *Tradition* of the Church inducing, and the *Scripture* confirming it. And I believe both *Scripture* and *Creed* in the same uncorrupted sense which the Primitive Church believed them; and am sure that I do so Believe them, because I crost not in my *Belief* any thing delivered by the *Primitive Church*. And this again I am sure of, because I take the Belief of the *Primitive Church*, as it is expressed, and delivered by the *Councils*, and *Ancient Fathers* of those times. As for the *Four Councils*, if A.C. ask how I have them; that is, their true and entire Copies? I answer, I have them from the *Church-Tradition* only: And that's Assurance enough for this. And so I am fully as sure as A.C. is, or can make me. But if he ask how I know infallibly I believe them in their *true and uncorrupted sense*? Then I answer, There's no man of knowledge, but he can understand the plain and simple Decision expressed in the *Canon* of the *Council*, where 'tis necessary to Salvation. And for all other *debates* in the *Councils*, or *Decisions* of it in things of less moment, 'tis not necessary that I, or any man else, have *Infallible Assurance* of them; though I think 'tis possible to attain, even in these things, as much *Infallible Assurance* of the uncorrupted sense of them, as A.C. or any other *Jesuites* have.

A.C. asks again, What Text of *Scripture* tells, That Protestants now living do believe all this, or that all this is expressed in those particular Bibles, or in the Writings of the Fathers and Councils, which now are in the Protestants hands? Good God! Whither will not a strong Bias carry even a learned Judgment!

Why,

Why, what Consequence is there in this? The Scripture now is the only Ordinary *Infallible Rule* of Divine Faith, Therefore the *Protestants* cannot believe all this before mentioned, unless a particular Text of *Scripture* can be shewed for it. Is it not made plain before, how we believe Scripture to be *Scripture*, and by Divine and *Infallible Faith* too, and yet we can shew no particular *Text* for it? Beside, were a *Text of Scripture* necessary, yet that is for the *Object* and the thing which we are to believe, not for the *Act* of our believing, which is merely from God, and in our selves, and for which we cannot have any *Warrant* from, or by *Scripture*, more than that we ought to believe; but not that we in our particular do believe. The rest of the Question is far more inconsequent, *VVhether all this be expressed in the Bibles which are in Protestants hands?* For first, we have the same *Bibles* in our hands, which the *Romanists* have in theirs; Therefore either we are Infallibly sure of ours, or they are not Infallibly sure of theirs; For we have the same *Book*, and delivered unto us by the same hands; and all is expressed in ours, that is in theirs. Nor is it of moment in this Argument, that we account more *Apocryphal* than they do; For I will acknowledge every *Fundamental point of Faith* as proveable out of the *Canon*, as we account it, as if the *Apocryphal* were added unto it. Secondly, *A. C.* is here extreamly out of himself, and his way; For his Question is, *VVhether all this be expressed in the Bibles which we have?* All this? All what? Why, before there is mention of the four *General Councils*; and in this Question here's mention of the *Writings of the Fathers and the Councils*. And what, will *A. C.* look that we must shew a *Text of Scripture* for all this, and an express one too? I thought, and do so still, 'tis enough

* Non potest aliquid certum esse certitudine Fidei, nisi aut immediata continetur in Verbo Dei: aut ex Verbo Dei per evidenter consequentiam deducatur. Bellar. L. 3. de Justif. c. 8. §. 2.

* Necessary Consequence out of Scripture, as well as upon express Text. And this I am sure

† Nec ego Nicenum, nec tu debes Ariminense tamquam praedicatorum preferre Concilium. Nec ego hujus Authoritate, nec tu illius determinis Scripturarum Authoritatem, &c. Res cum re, Causa cum causâ, Ratio cum ratione conceret. S. Aug. L. 3. cont. Maximum. c. 14. Testimonia Divina in fundamento ponenda sunt. S. Aug. L. 20. de Civ. Dei. c. 1. Quia principia hujus Doctrinae per Revelationem habentur, &c. Tho. p. 1. q. 1. A. 8. ad 2. Solis Scripturarum Libris canonibus didicis bunc bonorem deseritis, ut nullum Autorem eorum in scribendo errasse aliquid firmissime credam. Alios autem ita leto, ut quantumlibet sanctitate, doctrinâque propoleant, non idem verum putem, quod ipsi sic senserunt, vel scripsierunt. S. Aug. Epist. 19.

of, that neither I, nor any man else is bound to believe any thing as Necessary to Salvation, be it found in *Councils*, or *Fathers*, or where you will, † if it be Contrary to express *Scripture*, or necessary *Consequence* from it. And for the Copies of the *Councils* and *Fathers* which are in our hands, they are the same that are in the hands of the *Romanists*, and delivered to Posterity by *Tradition of the Church*, which is abundantly sufficient to warrant that.

So we are as Infallibly sure of this, as 'tis possible for any of you to be. Nay, are we not more sure? For we have used no

Index Expurgatorius upon the Writings of the Fathers *, * *Sixtus St-*
as you have done : So that Posterity hereafter must thank *nent. in Epist.*
us for true Copies both of *Councils* and *Fathers*, and not *ad Piam quatu-*
rum.

But A. C. goes on, and asks still, *Whether Protestants be Infallibly sure that they rightly understand the sense of all which is expressed in their Books, according to that which was understood by the Primitive Church, and the Fathers which were present at the four first General Councils ?* A. C. may ask everlastingly, if he will ask the same over and over again, For I pray wherein doth this differ from his † Question, save † §. 38. N. 5: only that here *Scripture* is not named? For there the Question was of our *Affurance of the Incorrupted sense*: And therefore thither I refer you for Answer, with this, That it is not required either of us, or of them, that there should be had an *Infallible assurance* that we rightly understand the sense of all that is expressed in our *Books*. And I think I may believe without sin, that there are many things expressed in these *Books* (for they are theirs as well as ours) which A. C. and his *Fellows* have not *Infallible assurance* that they rightly understand in the sense of the *Primitive Church*, or the *Fathers* present in those *Councils*. And if they say, Yes, they can, because when a difficulty crosses them, they believe them in the Churches sense: Yet that *dry shift* will not serve. For belief of them in the Churches sense is an *Implicit Faith*; but it works nothing distinctly upon the *understanding*: For by an *Implicit Faith* no man can be infallibly assured that he doth *rightly understand the sense* (which is A. C.'s Question) whatever perhaps he may *rightly believe*. And an *Implicit Faith*, and an *Infallible understanding* of the same thing, under the same Considerations, cannot possibly stand together in the same man at the same time.

A. C. hath not done asking yet: But he would farther know, *Whether Protestants can be Infallibly sure that all and only those points which Protestants account Fundamental and necessary to be expressly known by all, were so accounted by the Primitive Church ?* Truly, *Unity in the Faith* is very Considerable in the Church: And in this the *Protestants* agree, and as *Uniformly* as you, and have as *Infallible Assurance* as you can have, of all points which they account Fundamental; yea, and of all, which were so accounted by the *Primitive Church*. And these are but the *Creed*, and some few, and those *Immediate deductions* from it. And † *Tertullian* and * *Ruffinus* upon the very Clause of the Catholic Church, to decipher it, make a recital only of the Fundamental Points of Faith. And for the first of these, * *Ruffin. in Symb.*

* Et neque qui validus potens est in dicendo ex Ecclesia Prescello alia ab his dicit, &c. Neque dubilis in dicendo banc Traditionem immittit. Quoniam enim una & eadem fides sit, Neque is, qui multum de ea dicere potest, plusquam oportet, dicit, neque qui parum, idem immutat. Irenaeus. L. 1. adv. Her. c. 2. & 3. Et S. Basil. Serm. de Fide, To. 2. p. 193. Et S. Basil. 1903. Vnde & Imobilis Regula, &c. Terr. de Roland. Virg. c. 1.

was by that Famous and known place of * Irenaeus : where after he had recited the *Creed*, as the *Epitome* or Brief of the Faith, he adds, That none of the Governors of the Church, be they never so potent to Express themselves, can say alia ab his, other things frome these : Nor none so weak in Expression as to diminish this Tradition. For since the Faith is One, and the same, He that can say much of it, says no more than he ought ; Nor daeth he diminish it, that can say but little. And in this the Protestants all agree. And for the second, the immediate Deductions, they are not formally Fundamental for all men, but for such as are able to make or understand them. And for others, 'tis enough if they do not obstinately or Schismatically refuse them, after they are once revealed. Indeed you account many things Fundamental, which were never so accounted in any sense by the Primitive Churchs such as are all the Decrees of General Councils, which may be all true, but can never be all Fundamental in the Faith. For it is not

† Quantum ad prima Credibilitia, que sunt articuli Fidei, tenetur homini explicare credere, sicut & tentare habere fidem. Quantum ad secundam Credibilitia, &c. non tenetur explicare credere nisi quando hoc ei constituerit in Disciplina Eisdem concineri. Tho. 2. 2. q. 21. Ad 3. 6. Potest quis Errare crederet oppositum Alioquin articulo subtili, ad cuius patrem explicitam non omnes tenentur. Holcot. in Sen. q. 1. ad quartum.

so accounted in any sense by the Primitive Churchs such as are all the Decrees of General Councils, which may be all true, but can never be all Fundamental in the Faith. For it is not

¶ Resolutio Octauii est. Quod nec tota Ecclesia, nec Concilium Generale, nec summus Pontifex potest facere Articulum quod non sit Articulus. Articulus enim est ex eo solo, quia a Deo Revelatus est. Almain. en 3. sen. D. 45. q. unica. Concil. A. Dub. 3.

S. Jude vers. 3. once given (and but once for all) to the Saints, S. Jude 3. But if it be A.C.'s meaning to call for an Infallible Assurance of all such Points of Faith as are Decreed by General Councils. Then I must be bold to tell him : All those Decrees are not necessary to all mens salvation. Neither do the Romanists themselves agree in all such determined Points of Faith. Be they determined by Councils, or by Popes. For Instance. After those Books (which we account Apocryphæ) were * defined to be Canonized, and an *Anathema* pronounced in the Case,

+ Six. Senens. Biblioth. Sacra. L. 1. edit. 1611. ¶ Non est necessarium credendum Determinatio sum. Pontificem, &c. Almain. in 3. stat. D. 24. q. unica Concil. in Dubio. 6. folio.

a General Council, yet many Roman Catholicks defend the Contrary ; And so do all the Socinians at this very day. Therefore if there be Fundamental in the Faith, the Romanists differ one from another in the Faith, nay, in the Fundamentals of the Faith ; And therefore cannot have Infallible Assurance of them. Nor is there that Unity in the Faith amongst them, which they

so much, and so often boast of. For what Scripture is Canonical is a great point of Faith. And I believe they will not now Confess, That the Popes power over a General Council is a small one. And so let A. C. look to his own Infallible Assurance of Fundamentals in the Faith: for ours, God be thanked, is well. And since he is pleased to call for a particular Text of Scripture to prove all and every thing of this nature, which is ridiculous in it self, and unreasonable to demand (as hath been shewed) yet when he shall be pleased to bring forth but a particular known Tradition, to prove all and every thing of this on their side, it will then be perhaps time for him to call for, and for us to give farther Answer about particular Texts of Scripture.

After all this Questioning A. C. infers, That I had need seek NUM. 9. out some other Infallible Rule, and means, by which I may know A.C. p. 69. these things infallibly, or else that I have no reason to be so confident, as to adventure my soul, that one may be saved living and dying in the Protestant faith. How weak this Inference is, will easily appear, by that which I have already said to the premises; And yet I have somewhat left to say to this Inference also. And first, I have lived, and shall (God willing) die in the Faith of Christ, as it was professed in the Ancient Primitive Church, as it was professed in the present Church of England. And for the Rule which governs me herein, if I cannot be confident for my soul upon the Scripture, and the Primitive Church expounding and declaring it, I will be confident upon no other. And secondly, I have all the reason in the world to be confident upon this Rule; for this can never deceive me; Another (that very other which A. C. proposes) namely, the Faith of the Roman Church may. Therefore with A. C.'s leave, I will venture my salvation upon the Rule aforesaid, and not trouble myself to seek another of man's making, to the forsaking and weakening of this which God hath given me. For I know they committed two Evils, which forsook the Fountain of Living Waters, to hew out to themselves Cisterns, broken Cisterns, that can hold no Water, Jer. 2. For here's the Evil of Desertion of that which was Right: and the Evil of a bad Choice, of that which is hew'd out with much pains and care, and is after Useless and Unprofitable: But then Thirdly, I finde that a Romanist may make use of an Implicit Faith (at his pleasure) but a Protestant must know all these things Infallibly; that's A. C.'s word; Know these things; Why, but is it not enough to believe them? Now God forbid it should. Else what shall become of Millions of poor Christians in the world, which cannot know all these things, much less know them Infallibly? Well, I would not have A. C. weaken the Belief of poor Christians in this fashion. But for things that may be known as well as believed, nor I,

nor any other shall need forsake the Scripture, to seek another Rule to direct either our Conscience, or our Confidence.

NUM. 10.
A.C. p. 69.

A.C. p. 70.

* S. 25. N. 5.
S. 33. Confid. 3
N. 1.

† S. 33. N. 5.
|| A.C. p. 71.

A.C. p. 70.

Ephes. 4.5.
* S. 35. N. 1.

Rom. 14.4

+ S. 35. N. 2.
A.C. p. 70.

|| S. 33. N. 12.
S. 35. N. 7.

In the next place A. C. observes, That the Jesuite was as confident for his part, with this difference, that he had sufficient reason of his Confidence, but I had not for mine. This is said with the Confidence of a jesuite, but as yet, but said. Therefore he goes on and tells us, That the Jesuite had reason of his Confidence, out of express Scriptures, and Fathers, and the Infallible Authority of the Church. Now truly, Express Scriptures, with A. C's patience, he hath not named one that is express, nor can he. And the few Scriptures which he hath alledged, I have * Answered, and so have others. As for Fathers, he hath named very few, and with what success, I leave to the Readers judgment. And for the Authority of the Catholike Church, I hold it † as Infallible as he, and, upon better Grounds, but not so of a General Council, which he here means, as appears || after. And for my part I must yet think (and I doubt A. C. will not be able to disprove it) that express Scripture, and Fathers, and the Authority of the Church will rather be found proofs to warrant my Confidence, than his. Yea, but A. C. saith, That I did not then taxe the Jesuite with any rashness. It may be so; Nor did he me. So there we parted even. Yea, but he saith again, that I acknowledge there is but one saving Faith, and that the Lady might be saved in the Romane Faith, which was all the Jesuite took upon his soul. Why, but if this be all, I will confess it again. The first, That there is but one faith, I confess with S. Paul, Ephes. 4. And the other, that the Lady might be saved in the Romane Faith, or Church *, I confess with that charity which S. Paul teacheth me, Namely, to leave all men, especially the weaker both sex and sort, which hold the Foundation, to stand or fall to their own Master, Rom. 14. And this is no mistaken charity. As for the Inference which you would draw out of it, that's answered at large † already. But than A.C. adds, That I say, but without any proof, that the Romaniſts have many dangerous errors, but that I neither tell them which they be, nor why I think them dangerous, but that I leave them to look to their own souls; which (he says) they do, and have no cause to doubt. How much the Jesuite and A. C. have said in this Conference, without any solid Proof, I again submit to judgment, as also what Proofs I have made. If in this very place I have added none, 'tis because I had made proof enough of the self-same thing || before. Where, lest he should want and call for Proof again, I have plainly laid together some of the many Dangerous errors, which are charged upon them. So I tell you which, at least, some of which they be: and their very naming will shew their danger. And if I did remit you to look to your own souls, I hope there was no offence in that, if you doit, and do it

it so, that you have no cause to doubt. And the reason why you doubt not, A.C. tells us, is, Because you had no new device ^{A.C. p. 70.} of your own, or any other mens, nor any thing contrary to Scripture, but all most conformable to Scriptures interpreted by Union, Consent of Fathers, and Definitions of Councils. Indeed if this were true, you had little cause to doubt in point of your Belief. But the truth is, you do hold new Devices of your own, which the Primitive Church was never acquainted with. And some of those so far from being conformable, as that they are little less than contradictory to Scripture. In which particulars, and divers others, the Scriptures are not interpreted by Union, or Consent of Fathers, or Definitions of Councils, unless perhaps by some late Councils, packed of purpose to do that ill service. I have given Instances enough * before; yet some you shall have here, lest you should say again, that I affirm without proof or Instance. † I pray then whose Device was Transubstantiation? || And whose Communion under one kind? <sup>* S. 33. N. 12.
S. 35. N. 7.
† Conc. Lateran. Can. I.
|| Conc. Constan. Sess. 13.</sup>

* And whose Deposition and Unthroning, nay Killing of Princes, and the like, if they were not yours? For I dare say, and am able to prove, there's none of these but are rather contrary than conformable to Scripture. Neither is A.C. or any Jesuite able to shew any † Scripture interpreted by Union or || Consent of Fathers of the Primitive Church, to prove any one of these: Nor any Definition of

Ancient Councils, but only * Lateran for Transubstantiation, and that of † Constance for the Eucharist in one kind; which two are Modern at least, far downward from the Primitive Church; and have done more mischief to the Church, by those their Determinations, than will be cured I fear in many Generations. So whatever A.C. thinks, yet I had reason enough to leave the Jesuite to look to his own soul.

But A.C. having as it seems little new matter, is at the same ^{N U M. 11;} again, and over and over it must go, That there is but one ^{A.C. p. 70.} saving

^{* Propter Harefum Rex non solum Regno praevaratur, sed etiam filii eius a Regni successione pelluntur. Simanca Casbol. Inst. tit. 9. S. 259. Absoluti sunt Subditis a debito Fidelitatis: Et custodis Arcium, &c. Ibid. tit. 46. S. 37. It was stily avowed long since by —— That no man could shew any one Romane Catholice of note and Learning, that affirmed it lawful to kill Kings upon any pretence whatsoever. Now surely he that says as Romane do, that 'tis lawful to Depose a King, says upon the matter, 'tis lawful to kill him. For Kings do not use to be long-liv'd after their Deposition: And they seldom stay till grief break their hearts: They have Assassines ready to make shorter work. But since he is so confident, I'll give him an Author of note, and very Learned, that speaks it out. Rex debet occidi, si sollicitus populum colere Idola, vel defere Legem Dei. Tofst. in Sam. c. 11. q. 17. And he makes bold with Scripture to prove it; Duet. 13. And Emanuel Sg in his Aphorisms, Verbo Tyrannus, yet he is so moderate, that he would not have this done, till he be Somone'd; but then, Quisquis potest furi Executor. Mariana is far worse: for he says it is lawful to kill him, postquam a paucis Seditiosis, sed fortia capitur Tyrannus appellari. L. I. de Reg. Et Reg. Institutione, c. 6. Yea but Mariana was disclaimed for this by the Jesuites. Yea but for all that, there was an Apologie Printed in Italy, An. 1610. Permissa Superiorum. And there 'tis said, They were all Enemies of the holy Name of Jesus, that condemned Mariana for any such Doctrine. As for Tofst. no Sentence hath touched upon him at all for it.}

^{+ Corpus Christi veraliter esse in Eucharistia ex Evangelio habemus: Conversionem vero Panis in Corpus Christi; Evangelium non explicavit, sed exprise ab Ecclesia accepimus. Cajetan. in Thom. 3. q. 75. Art. 1.}

^{|| De transubstantiatione Panis in Corpus Christi rara est in antiquis Scripturis mentione. Alpha Calvo, L. 3. adver. Har. Verbo Indulgenter.}

^{* Concil. Lateran. Can. I.}

^{+ concil. constan. Sess. 13.}

*Saving Faith: That this one Faith was once the Romane. And that I granted, one might be saved in the Romane Faith. To all which I have abundantly answered *before. Marry then he infers, That he sees not how we can have our souls saved, without we entirely hold this Faith, being the Catholike Faith, which S. Athanasius saith, unless a man hold entirely, he cannot be saved. Now here again is more in the Conclusion than in the Premises; and so the Inference fails. For say there was a time in which the Catholike and the Romane Faith were one; and such a time there was, when the Romane*

Rom. 1. 8.

+ Concil. Trident. Bull. Pii 4. super forma Juramenti professionis Fidei ad finem. Council. Trident. *Faith was Catholike and famous through the world, Rom. 1. Yet it doth not follow, since the + Council of Trent hath added a new Creed, that this Romane Faith is now the Catholike. For it hath added extranea, things without the Foundation, disputable, if not false Conclusions to the Faith. So that now a man may Believe the whole and entire Catholike Faith, even as S.*

*Athanasius requires, and yet justly refuse for dross a great part of that which is now || the Romane Faith. And Athanasius himself, as if he meant to arm the Catholike Faith against all corrupting Additions, hath in the beginning of his * Creed, these words, This is the Catholike Faith, This, and no other: This and no Other, then here follows. And again at the end of his Creed, + This is the Catholike Faith, || This and no more than is here delivered, (always presupposing the Apostles Creed, as Athanasius did) and this is the largest of all Creeds. So that if A. C. would wipe his eyes from the mist which rises about Tyber, he might see how our souls may be saved, believing the Catholike Faith, and that entire, without the Addition of Romane Leaven. But if he cannot, or, I doubt, will not see it; 'tis enough that by Gods*

** S. Athanas. in Symb.*

+ And yet the Council of Trent having added twelve new Articles, says thus of them also: Hec est vera Catholica Fides, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, &c. Bulla Pii 4. super forma Juramenti professionis Fidei. In fine Council. Trident.

|| Inter am Fidet Veritatem, ejus Dolatri van brucuter continet. Tho. 2. 24. q. 1. A. 10. ad 3.

grace we see it. And therefore once more I leave him and his, to look to their own souls.

NUM. 12. After this, A. C. is busie in unfolding the meaning of this great A. C. p. 70th Father of the Church, S. Athanasius. And he tells us, That he says in his Creed, That without doubt every man shall perish, that holds not the Catholike Faith entire, (that is, saith A. C. in every Point of it) and inviolate (that is, in the right sense) and for the true formal reason of divine Revelation, sufficiently applied to our understanding by the Infallible Authority of the Catholike Church proposing to us by her Pastors this Revelation. Well, we shall not differ much from A. C. in expounding the meaning of S. Athanasius; yet some few things I shall here observe. And first, I agree that he which hopes for Salvation, must believe the Catholike Faith whole and entire in every Point. Next, I agree, that

that he must likewise hold it *inviolate*, if to believe it in the right sense, be to hold it *inviolate*. But by A.C.'s leave, the Believing of the *Creed*, in the right sense, is comprehended in the first branch, *The keeping of it whole and entire*. For no man can properly be said to believe the *Whole Creed*, that believes not the *Whole Sense*, as well as the *Letter* of it, and as entirely. But *thirdly*, for the word *inviolate*, tis indeed used by him that translated Athanasius. But the Father's own words, following the Common Edition, are, That he that will be saved must keep the *Faith* ~~in inviolate~~. Now *in inviolate* is the sound and entire Faith. And it cannot be a *sound Faith*, unless the *Sense* be as *whole* and *entire* as the *Letter* of the *Creed*. And *in inviolate* is compounded of the Privative particle (*not*) and *vulnus*, which is reproach or infamy. So that *in inviolate* signifies, the holding of the entire Faith in such holiness of life and conversation, as is without all infamy and reproach. That is, as our English renders that *Creed* exceeding well: *Which Faith unless a man do keep whole and undefiled*, even with such a life as *Momus* himself shall not be able to carp at. So Athanasius (who certainly was passing able to express himself in his own Language), in the beginning of that his *Creed* requires, That we keep it *entire*, without diminution, and *undefiled*, without blame. And at the end, that we believe it *faithfully*, without wavering. But [*inviolate*] is the mistaken word of the old Interpreter, and with no great knowledge made use of by A.C. And then *fourthly*, though this be true *Dramity*, That he which hopes for Salvation, must believe the *Whole Creed*, and in the *right sense* too (if he be able to comprehend it) yet I take the *true and first meaning* of *inviolate* (as could Athanasius his word *in inviolate* have signified so) not to be the holding of the *true sense*, but not to offer *violence*, or a forced *sence* or *meaning* upon the *Creed*; which every man doth not, that yet believes it not in a *true sence*. For not to believe the *true sense* of the *Creed*, is one thing: But tis quite another, to force a *wrong sence* upon it. *Fifthly*, a Reason would be given also, why A.C. is so earnest for the *whole Faith*, and baulks the word which goes with it, which is *holy* or *undefiled*. For Athanasius doth alike exclude from Salvation those which keep not the *Catholike Faith* *holy*, as well as these which keep it not *whole*. I doubt this was to spare many of his *holy Fathers*, the *Popes*, who were as far as any (the very lewdest among men without exception) from keeping the *Catholike Faith* *holy*. *Sixthly*, I agree to the next part of his Exposition, That a man that will be saved must believe the *whole Creed* for the *true formal reason of divine Revelation*. For upon the Truth of God thus revealed by Himself, lies the *infallible certainty* of the *Christian Faith*. But I do not grant, that this is within the compass of S. Athanasius his word *in inviolate*, nor of the

* Sic Ecclesia
dictum: *in invio-*
late, Eph. 5.27
& in veteri
Glossario, Im-
maculatus.
in inviolate.

A.C. p. 70.

the word *Inviolate*. But in that respect 'tis a mere strain of A. C. And then lastly, though the whole Catholike Church be sufficient in applying this to us and our Belief, not our Understanding, which A. C. is at again; yet *Infallible* She is not, in the proposal of this *Revelation* to us by every of her Pastors, somewhereof amongst you, as well as others, neglect, or forget at least to feed Christ's sheep, as Christ and his Church hath fed them.

NUM. 13.

A.C. p. 70.

A.C. p. 70.

A.C. p. 70.

But now that A. C. hath taught us (as you see) the meaning of S. Athanasius; in the next place he tells us, *That if we did believe any one Article, we (finding the same formal Reason in all, and applied sufficiently by the same means to all) would easily believe all.* Why surely we do not believe any one Article entirely, but all the Articles of the Christian Faith; And we believe them for the same formal Reason in all, namely, *Because they are revealed from and by God, and sufficiently applied in his Word, and by his Churches Ministrations.* *But so long as they do not believe all in this sort (saith A.C.)* Look you; He tells us we do not believe all, when we profess we do. Is this man become as God, that he can better tell what we believe, than we our selves? Surely we do believe all, and in that sort too: Though, I believe, were S. Athanasius himself alive again, and a plain man should come to him; and tell him he believed his Creed in all and every particular; he would admit him for a good Catholike Christian, though he were not able to express to him the formal reason of that his belief. *Tea but (saith A.C.) while they will, as all Hereticks do, make choice of what they will, and what they will not believe, without relying upon the Infallible Authority of the Catholike Church, they cannot have that one saving Faith in any one Article.* Why, but whatsoever Hereticks do, we are not such, nor do we so. For they which believe all the Articles (as once again I tell you we do) make no choice; And we do rely upon the Infallible Authority of the Word of God, and the whole Catholike Church; And therefore we both can have, and have that one saving Faith which believes all the Articles entirely, though we cannot believe that any particular Church is infallible.

NUM. 14.

A.C. p. 71.

And yet again A. C. will not thus be satisfied, but on he goes, and adds, *That although we believe the same truth which other good Catholikes do in some Articles, yet not believing them for the same formal reason of Divine Revelation sufficiently applied by Infallible Church-Authority, &c. we cannot be said to have one and the same Infallible and Divine Faith which other good Catholike Christians have, who believe the Articles for this formal Reason, sufficiently made known to them, not by their own fancy, nor the fallible Authority of humane deductions, but by the Infallible Authority of the Church of God.* If A. C. will still lay the same thicke, I must still give the same answer. First,

2dly

he

he confesses we believe the same Truth in some Articles (I pray mark his phrase) the same Truth in some Articles with other good Catholike Christians; so far his Pen hath told Truth against his will: for he doth not (I wot well) intend to call us *Catholike*, and yet his Pen being truer than himself, hath let it fall. For the word (*other*) cannot be so used as here it is, but that we, as well as they, must be good *Catholikes*: For he that shall say, the old *Romans* were valiant, as well as other men, supposes the *Romans* to be valiant men; And he that shall say, The *Protestants* believe some Articles, as well as other good *Catholikes*, must in propriety of speech suppose them to be good *Catholikes*. Secondly, as we do believe those *some Articles*, so do we believe them, and all other *Articles of Faith*, for the same formal reason, and so applied, as but just before I have expressed. Nor do we believe any one *Article of Faith* by our own fancy, or by fallible Authority of humane deductions; but next to the *Infallible Authority of God's Word*, we are guided by his Church. But then *AC.* steps into a Conclusion, whether we cannot follow him? For he says, that the Article to be believed must be sufficiently made known unto us by the Infallible Authority of the Church of God, that is, of men Infallibly assisted by the Spirit of God, as all lawfully called, continued, and confirmed General Councils are assisted. That the whole Church of God is infallibly assisted by the Spirit of God, so that it cannot by any error fall away totally from Christ the Foundation, I make no doubt. For if it could, the gates of Hell had prevailed against it, which, our Saviour assures me, S. Matth. 16.18. they shall never be able to do. But that all General Councils, be they never so lawfully called, continued, and confirmed, have *Infallible Assistance*, I utterly deny. 'Tis true, that a General Council *de post facto*, after tis ended, and admitted by the whole Church, is then *Infallible*; for it cannot erre in that which it hath already clearly and truly determined without Error. But that a General Council *a parte ante*, when it first sits down and continues to deliberate, may truly be said to be *Infallible* in all its *after-determinations*, whatsoever they shall be, I utterly deny. And it may be it was not without cunning that *AC.* shuffled these words together, *Called, Continued, and Confirmed*; for be it never so lawfully called, and continued, it may erre. But after tis *confirmed*, that is, admitted by the whole Church, then being found true, it is also *Infallible*; that is, it deceives no man. For so all *Truth* is, and is to us, when tis once known to be *Truth*. But then many times that *Truth*, which being known is necessary and *Infallible*, was before both contingent and fallible in the way of proving it, and to us. And so here, a *General Council* is a most probable, but yet a fallible way of inducing *Truth*, though the *Truth* once induced may be

(After this sound) necessary and Infallible. And so likewise the very Council it self for that particular in which it hath concluded Truth. But A.C. must both speak and mean of a Council set down to deliberate, or else he says nothing. or if he does

N U M. 15.
A.C. p. 71.

Now hence A.C. gathers, That though every thing defined to be a Divine Truth in General Councils is not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually believed (as some other Truths are) by all sorts: yet no man may (after knowledge that they are thus defined) doubt deliberately, much less obstinately deny the Truth of any thing so defined. Well, in this Collection of A.C. first we have this granted. That every thing defined in General Councils is not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually believed by all sorts of men. And this no Protestant, that I know, denies. Secondly, it is affirmed, that after knowledge that these Truths are thus defined, no man may doubt deliberately, much less obstinately deny any of them. Truly, obstinately (as the word is now in common use) carries a faint along with it: And it ought to be far from the temper of a Christian to be obstinate against the Definitions of a General Council. But that he may not upon very probable grounds, in an humble and peaceable manner deliberately doubt you, and upon Demonstrative grounds ~~completely~~ deny even such Definitions, yet submitting himself and his grounds to the Church in that or another Council, is that which was never till now imposed upon Believers. For it is one thing for a man deliberately to doubt, and modestly to propose his Doubts for satisfaction, which was ever lawful, and is many times necessary. And quite another thing for a man upon the pride of his own Judgment, *to refuse external Obedience to the Council, which to do, was never Lawful, nor can ever stand with any Government. For there is all the reason in the world, the Council should be heard for it self, as well as any such Recusant whatsoever, and that before a Judge as good as it self at least. And to what end did S. Augustine say, That one General Council might be attended by another, the former by the Later, if men might neither deny, nor so much as deliberately doubt of any of these Truths defined in a General Council? And A.C. should have done well to have named but one ancient Father of the Primitive Church, that ever affirmed this.

[†] S. Aug. l.2.
de Bapt. cont.
Donat. c.3. Ip-
saque plenaria,
(ept prioria &
posterioribus e-
mendari.

* S. 21. N. 5.

* For the Assistance which God gives to the whole Church in general, is but in things simply necessary to eternal salvation; therefore more than this cannot be given to a General Council, no nor so much. But then if a General Council shall forget it self, and take upon it to define things not absolutely necessary to be expressly known, or actually believed (which are the things which A.C. here speaks of) In these as neither General Council, nor the whole Church have infallible Assistance: so have Christians

Christians liberty modestly and peaceably, and upon just grounds, both deliberately to doubt, and constantly to deny such the Councils Definitions. For instance, the Council of Florence first defined Purgatory to be believed as a Divine Truth, and matter of Faith (* if that Council had Consent enough so to define it.) This was afterwards deliberately doubted of by the Protestants; after this as constantly denied, then confirmed by the Council of Trent, and an Anathema set upon the head of every man that denies it. And yet scarce any Father within the first three hundred years ever thought of it.

Con. Sess. ult. apud Nicolinum, to. 4. p. 894, &c. This favours of some art to bring in the Greeks. Howsoever this shews enough against Bellarmine, That all the Greeks did not constantly teach Purgatory, as he affirms, L. 1. de Purgat. c. 11. §. De tertio modo.

+ Concil. Trid. Sess. 23. & in Bullâ Pii 4. super forma Juramenti professionis Fidei.

I know * Bellarmine affirms it boldly, That all the Fathers, both Greek and Latine, did constantly teach Purgatory from the very Apostles times. And where he brings his Proofs out of the Fathers for this Point, he divides them into two Ranks. + In the first, he reckons them which affirm Prayer for the dead, as if that must necessarily infer Purgatory. Whereas most certain it is, that the Ancients had, and gave other Reasons of Prayer for the dead, then freeing them out of any Purgatory. And this is very Learnedly, and at large set down, by the now Learned Primate of Armagh. But then in the second, he says, there are b most manifest places in the Fathers, in which they affirm Purgatory. And he names there no fewer then two and twenty of the Fathers. A great Jury certainly, did they give their Verdict with him. But first, within the three hundred years after Christ, he names none but Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen. And c Tertullian speaks expressly of Hell, not of Purgatory. d S. Cyprian of a Purging to Amendment, which cannot be after this Life. As for c Origen, he, I think, indeed was the first Founder of Purgatory; But of such an One, as I believe Bellarmine dares not affirm. For he thought there was no Punishment after this life, but Purgatory; and that not onely the most impious men, but even the Devils themselves should be saved, after they had suffered and been Purged enough. Which is directly contrary to the Word of God expounded by his f Church. In the fourth and fifth (the great and Learned Ages of the Church) he names more, as g S. Ambrose. But S. Ambr. says, That some shall be saved, *quasi per ignem*, as it were by fire, leaving it as doubtful, what was meant by that Fire, as the Place it self doth whence it is taken: h i Cor. 3. i S. Hierome indeed names Purging by fire; But tis not very plain, that he means it after this life. And howsoever, this is most plain, That S. Hierome is at Credimus, we believe eternal

Punis- 66 I. ai. fine:

Punishment ; but he goes no farther than *Arbitramur*, we think there is a *Purging*. So with him it was *Arbitrary* ; And therefore sure no *Matter of Faith* then. And again * he saith; That

* S. Hiero. I. 4.
cont. Pelag. ultra medium.

† S. Basil. in
Ijat. 9.

|| Paulin. Ep. 1.

* Greg. Naz.
Orat. 39. fin.
† I think the
first that ever
used that
phrase, *Bap-*
tism by fire,
was *Orius*.

And he used
it for Martyr-
dom, as clearly
appears by
a passage of
his in *Euseb.*
L. 6. Hist. c. 4.
Edit. Grac.
Lat. Collinie
Allob. 1612.

|| Lact. L. 7. c.
21.

* S. Hilary. in
B. 118. v. 20.

|| Boetius. L.
4. Prof. 4.

* Theo. in
1 cor. 3.

† Bellarm. L. 1. de Purgato. c. 5. s.
EX Gracis habemus.

|| S. Greg. Nyss. Orat. de Mortuis. p.
1066. Edit. Paris. 1615. Tom. 2.
Διά τροπούχος την φιλοσοφίας
εκπαθεόντες ου μετ' αὐτῷ, ὅτι τοι
ἔμπλοβοια τοῦ λύκου σύνδει, ὅτι
ibid. p. 1067. οὐ τοι κατεποιεῖ συνέδει
επιβαλλεῖσθαι, ὅτι ibid. p. 1068.

names indeed *Purgatory fire* ; but he relates as uncertainly, to that in *I Cor. 3.* as S. Ambrose doth. As for || *Paulinus*, he speaks for *Prayer for the dead*, but not a word of *Purgatory*. And the Place in * *S. Gregory Nazianzen* is far from a manifest Place. For he speaks there of *Baptism by fire* ; which is no usual phrase to signify *Purgatory*. But yet say that here he doth, there's a *τοξόδιον, a fortassis, a peradventure* in the words, which *Bellarmino* cunningly leaves out. And if it be a *Peradventure* ye shall then be *Baptized with fire* ; why then 'tis at a *Peradventure* too, that ye shall not. Now such Casual stuff as this ; *peradventure* you shall, and *peradventure* you shall not, is no Expression for things, which are valued to be *de fide*, and to be believed as *Matters of Faith*. *Bellarmino* goes on with || *Lactantius*, but with no better success. For he says indeed, That some men *perstrin- gentur igne*, shall be sharply touched by fire. But he speaks of such, *quorum peccata prævaluerunt*, whose sins have prevailed. And they in *Bellarmino's* Doctrine are for *Hell*, not *Purgatory*. As for * *S. Hilary*, he will not come home neither. 'Tis true, he speaks of a *Fire* too, and one that must be indured ; but he tells us, 'tis a *punishment expiande à peccatis animæ*, to purge the soul from sins. Now this will not serve *Bellarmino's* turn. For they of *Rome* teach, That the sins are forgiven here, and that the Temporal Punishment onely remains to be satisfied in *Purga- tory*. And what need is there then of purging of sins ? Lest there should not be Fathers enough, he reckons in || *Boetius* too. But he, though not long before a *Convert*, yet was so well seen in this Point, that he goes no farther than *Puto*, I think that after death some souls are exercised *purgatoriæ clementiæ*, with a *Purgative Clemency*. But *Puto*, I think 'tis so, is no expression for *Matter of Faith*. The two pregnant Authorities which seem to come home, are those of *Gregory Nyssen*, and *Theodo- ret*. But for * *Theodoret in Scholis Grecois* (which is the Place *Bellarmino* quotes) I can finde no such Thing :

And manifest it is, *Bellarmino* + himself took it but upon trust. And for || *S. Gregory Nyssen*, 'tis true, some places in him seem plain. But then they are made so doubtful by other Places in him, that I dare not say simply and roundly, what his *Judgment* was. For he says, *Men must be purged from Perturbations, and either by Prayers, and Philosophy, or the study of Wisdom, or by the furnace of Purgatory-fire after this life*. And again, *That*

That a man cannot be partaker ~~dwelling~~ of the Divine nature, unless the Purgating-fire doth take away the stains that are in his Soul. And again, That after this life a Purgatory-fire takes away the blots and propensity to evil. And I deny not, divers other like places are in him. But first, this is quite another thing from the Roman Purgatory. For S. Gregory tells us here, that the Purgatory he means, purges Perturbations, and stains, and blots, and propensity to evil. Whereas the Purgatory which

Rome now teaches, purges not sin, * but is only satisfactory by way of punishment for sins already forgiven, but for which satisfaction was not made before their Death. Secondly, S. Gregory Nyssen himself seems not obscurely to relate to some other Fire. * For he says expressly, That the soul is to be punished, till the Vitiosity of it be consumed, Purga-

* Item definimus, si vere penitentes in Dei charitate decesserint, antequam dignissima penitentia frudibus de Commisso. Omissi satisfecerint, penitio Purgatorii post mortem pangari, Concil. Floren. circa prim. per Bin. Edit. Colon. 1610.

torio igne; So the Translation renders it; but in the Original p. 658.

it is *το ενείσιτη φως*, that is, in a fire that sleeps not, which, for ought appears, may be understood of a Fire that is eternal; whereas the fire assigned to Purgatory shall cease. Besides, S. Gregory says plainly: The Soul cannot suffer by fire but in the Body; and the Body cannot be with it, till the Resurrection. Therefore † he must needs speak of a fire after the Resurrection, which must be either the Fire of the General Conflagration, or Hell; Purgatory he cannot mean; Where, according to the Romish Tenet, the Soul suffers without the Body. The truth

* S.Greg.Nyss.
da Annal. Refut. Tom. 2.

is: Divers of the Ancient, especially Greeks, which were a little too much acquainted with Plato's School, || philosophized, and disputed upon this, and some other Points with much Obscurity, and as little Certainty. So upon the whole matter, in the fourth and fifth hundred year, you see here's none that constantly and

† S.Greg.Orat.
3. de Resurrect.
Christi.

perspicuously affirm it. And as for S. Augustine he ^a said; and ^b unsaid it, and ^c at the last left it doubtful; which had it then been received as a Point of Faith, he durst not have done.

|| Non expedit philosophari ab
tuis, &c. Orig. L.6. cont. Cil.
sum.

Indeed then in S. Gregory the Great's time, in the beginning of the sixth Age, Purgatory was grown to some perfection. For S. d Gregory himself is at scio ('twas but at Puto a little before) I know that some shall be Expiated in Purgatory flames. And therefore I will easily give Bellarmine all that follow. For after this time Purgatory was found too warm a business to be suffered to Cool again. And in the after

a constat Animas purgari post hanc vi-

tam, S.August.Lib.21.Civ.Dei, c.24.

vide.

b Justorum flagella non incipiunt post mortem, sed defensione. Et Anima mox in Paradisum, &c. S.Aug. contr.Faliciatum, c.15. Et dum tantum loca esse, &c. S. Aug. Ser.19. de verb. Apost.c.15. Et L.21 de Civ. Dei, c.16. fine, Negat, nisi sit ignis ille in Consummatione seculi.

c Quæri potest, &c. S.Aug. in Enchirid. c.59. Forstian verum est, &c. S.Aug.

L.21 de Civ.Dñi,c.26. Quid S.Paulus. servit, 1 Cor. 3. de Igne illo, malo intelligentiores, & doctiores audire, S.

Aug. L. de Fide & Oper. c.15.

d S.Greg. in Psal. 3. Penitentiale

princ.

Ages, more were frightened, than led by proof into the Belief of it.

Now by this we see also, That it could not be a Tradition; NUM. 17. For then we might have traced it by the smoke to the Apostles times. Indeed Bellarmine would have it such a Tradition.

For

* Quod Universa tenet Ecclesia, nec Consilium institutum sed semper retentum est, non nisi Authoritate apostolica traditum recensime creditur. S. Aug. L. 4, de Bapt. cont. Donatist. c. 24. Nec ad Summos Pontifices referunt potest. Addit Melch. Canus. L. 3. de Locus. c. 4. prius.

† Non inventimus initium bujus dogmati, sed omnes rationes Greco- & Latinis. &c. Bellar. L. 1. de Purg. c. 11. §. De tertio modo. || L. 1. de Purg. * 5. 38. N. 16.

And he addes, *That thererudie Purgatory is not believed by the Grecians to this very day*; And what wot I pray, after all this, may I not so much as deliberately doubt of this, because tis now defined? and but now in a manner; and thus? No fute, do A. C. tells you. Doubt? No. For when you had scolded the Archibishop of Spalato, back to Rome, where you either made him say, or said it for him; [for in Point it is, and under his Name] That since tis now defined by the Church, a man is as much bound to believe there is a Purgatory, as that *there is a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead*. How far comes this sort of Blasphemy, to make the Trinity, and Purgatory, things alike and equally Credible? all Points in which in the Doctrine of the First Prelates differ from them. In his Relation of the first Conference, p. 22.

Yea, but A. C. will give you a Reason, why I might say so. Liberately doubt, much less deny any thing that is defined by a General Council. And his Reason is, Because every such doubt and denial is a breach from the one saving faith. This is a very good reason, if it be true. But how appears it to be true? How? why it takes away the infallible credit from the Church, and so the Divine Revelation not being sufficiently applied, it cannot according to the ordinary course of Gods providence breed infallible Belief in us. Why but deliberately to doubt, and constantly to deny, upon the grounds and in the manner before laid, doth not take away infallible credit from the whole Church, but onely from the Definition of a General Council some way or other missed, And that in things not absolutely Necessary to all mens Salvation; for of such things A. C. here speaks exprely. Now to take away infallible credit from some Definitions of General Councils, in things not absolutely necessary to Salvation, is no breach upon the one saving Faith which is necessary, nor upon the Credit of the Catholic Church of Christ in things absolutely necessary, for which onely it had infallible assistance promised. So that no breach being made uppon the Faith, nor no Credit which ever it had being taken from the Church, the Divine Revelation may be, and is as sufficiently applied as ever it was; and in the ordinary course of Gods providence may breed as infallible belief in things necessary to Salvation, as ever it did.

But A. C. will prove his Reason before giving, and therefore he asks out of S. Paul, Rom. 10. *How shall men believe unless they hear?* How shall they hear without a Preacher? And how shall they preach (to wit, infallibly) unless they be sent, that is, from God, and infallibly assisted by his spirit? Here's that which I have twice at least spoken to already, namely, That A. C. by this will make every Priest in the Church of Rome that hath

Purgatorium nullum esse, est manifestum, See Manton, de Dominio, ad Antilogia, p. 202. &c. also his Annotations upon the Psalms, p. 19. Merit, Indulgencies, & Remission, his Annotations upon the Epistles of St. Paul, &c. &c. Fundamentum, quod non ultra minus reverendum, quod propter id p. 32. And so much A. C. himself says of

on. 511.4

+ Though every Thing defined to be a Divine Truth in General Councils, is not absolutely necessary to be exprely known, and actually believed by all sorts, &c. A. C. p. 71.

N. U. M. 19.
A. C. p. 71.
Rom. 10:
14, 15.

hath Learning enough to preach, and dissent not from that Church, an *Infallible Preacher*, which no Father of the Primitive Church did ever assume to himself, nor the Church give him. And yet the Fathers of the Primitive Church were sent, and from God, were assisted, and by God, and did sufficiently propose to men, the *Divine Revelation*, and did by it beget and breed up Faith, saving Faith, in the Souls of men:

¶ Alii eis Anteiorum canonicis scriptis non sicut quatuor sanctis ecclesiasticis prophetis, sed ministris patrum, quod est sic sollicitum, et confirmatum. Ex aliis scriptis. Ex S. Aug. 15. In libro de credo, et Demonstracione acquisitio et laus Lxxviii. 3. Quod Hierosol. Eccl. 10. ex vii. Hymni. 3. A. item of hoc. ¶ H. d. C. A. 15. ibid. ad al. mod. 12. ¶ Cuiusmodi sunt illi. ¶

¶ *Vnde hoc* to interpret Scripture: For I do not finde *How shall they preach* *apostoli nos*: (No wit, ¶ *Infallibly*) to be the *Content* of any one of the Fathers, *infallible*, or any other approved Author. And let him shew it, if illa enim immo he can.

¶ Alii eis *non sicut ex aliis ut habeat scripturam colliguntur* *et* *Biel* *in* *3. Sim. D. 23. q. 1. A. 2. C. M. 1.* *Ego Fides* *acquisita necessaria est. Alioquin si prius acquisitum, innulla etiam requiriatur, et non solum propriam intentionem Actus, sed etiam propter Allementum & Credendum. Quia non potest esse primum. Afflus a Fide acquisita. Quia per eam nullus credit, alius nisi quoniam possit falli ex fallere, licet credat illi non possit fallere. Scimus in 3. Sim. D. 23. q. unica. Therefore in the judgment of your own School, your Priacher can both deserve and be deceived. And therefore certainly are not *Infallible*. And Mr. Canis very exprestly makes this but an *Introduction* to *Infallible* *Faith*. *Primum ergo id statim iuxta Confessionem Legis aliqua materia & banalis tractamenta necessaria est*, *quibus ad Evangelium fidem indicantur*. *Quonodo enim creditur ei, quem non audierunt*, *cre. Canus L. 2. de Loxo, c. 8. ¶ Primum ergo id statim. Si videt omnia ita Fidel acquisire niteretur, tamen non Fundamento; ipsum Fundamentum Fidei nostra non esse Divina, sed Humana Veritas. Ibid. ¶ Cui & tertium. Therefore surely A. C. abusus this place of the *Apostle* very boldly.**

TO VIEW CIRCA

N U M. 20.
A.C. p. 71.
¶ After this (for I see the good man is troubled, and forward and backward he goes) he falls immediately upon this Question: *If a whole General Council defining what is Divine Truth, be not believed to be sent and assisted by God's Spirit, and consequently of Infallible Credit*; what man in the world can be said to be of Infallible Credit? Well, first, A.C. hath very ill luck in fitting his Conclusion to his Premises, and his Consequent to his Antecedent; And so 'tis here with him. For a General Council may be assisted by God's Spirit, and in a great measure too, and in a greater than any private man not inspired, and yet not consequently be of Infallible credit: for all assistance of God's Spirit reaches not up to Infallibility. I hope the *Antient Bishops*, and *Fathers of the Primitive Church* were assisted by God's Spirit, and in a plentiful measure too, and yet A.C. himself will not say they were *Infallible*. And secondly, for the Question it self, *If a General Council be not, what man in the world can be said to be of Infallible Credit?* Truly I'll make you a ready Answer, No man. Not the Pope himself? No: Let God and his Word be true, and every man a Lyer. Rom. 3. for so, more or less, every man will be found to be. And this is

Rom. 3. 4. *and*

neither damage to the Church, nor wrong to the person of any,

But then A. C. asks a shrewder Question than this. If such NUM. 27.
a Council lawfully called, continued and confirmed, may erre
in defining any one Divine Truth; how can we be Infallibly cer-
tain of any other Truth defined by it? For if it may erre in one, S. 10. N. 15.
why not in another, and another, and so in all? Tis most true,
if such a Councel may erre in one, it may in another, and an-
other, and so in all of like nature: I say in all of like na-
ture. And A. C. may remember he expressed himself a little A.C. p. 71.
before, to speak of the Desining of such Divine Truths as are
not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually belie-
ved of all sorts of men. Now there is, there can be no neces-
sity of an Infallible certainty in the whole Catholike Church, and
much less in a General Council, of things not * absolutely neces- S. 21. N. 5.
sary in themselves. For Christ did not intend to leave an In-
fallible certainty in his Church to satisfie either Contentions,
or Curios, or Presumptuous Spirits. And therefore in things
not Fundamental, not Necessary, 'tis no matter if Councils erre
in one, and another, and a third, the whole Church having power
and means enough to see that no Council erre in Necessary
things, and this is certainty enough for the Church to have/
or for Christians to expect; especially since the Foundation is
so strongly, and so plainly laid down in scripture and the Creeds;
that a modest man might justly wonder why any man should run
to any later Council, at least for any Infallible certainty.

Yet A. C. hath more Questions to ask; and his next is; How NUM. 22.
we can (according to the ordinary Course) be Infallibly assured A.C. p. 72.
that it erre in one, and not in another, when it equally by one
and the same Authority defines both to be Divine Truth? A. C.
taking here upon him to defend M. Fisher the Jesuite, could not
but see what I had formerly written concerning this difficult
Question about General Councils. And to all that (being large)
he replied little or nothing. Now when he thinks that may be
forgotten, or as if he did not at all lye in his way, he here turns
Questionist, to disturb that business, and indeed the Church, as
much as he can. But to this Question also I answer again, If
any General Council do now erre, either it erre in things ab-
solutely necessary to Salvation, or in things not necessary. If it
erre in things Necessary, we can be infallibly assured by the Scri-
pture, the Creeds, the four first Councils, and the whole Church,
where it erre in one, and not in another. If it be in non ne-
cessaries, in things not necessary, 'tis not requisite that we should
have for them an infallible assurance. As for that which fol-
lows, it is notoriously both cunning, and false. Tis false to
suppose that a General Council defining two things for Divine
Truths, and erring in one, but not erring in another, doth de-

fiae both equally by one, and the same Authority. And tis canning, because these words (*by the same Authority*) are equivocal, and must be distinguished, that the Truth, which A. C. would hide, may appear. Thus then, suppose a General Council erring in one point, and not in another, it doth define both, and equally by the same delegated Authority which that Council hath received from the Catholike Church. But it doth not define both, and much less equally, by the same Authority of the Scripture, (which must be the Councils Rule, as well as private mens) nor by the same Authority of the whole Catholike Church (who did not intentionally give them equal power to define Truth, and error for Truth.) And I hope A. C. dares not say the Scripture (according to which all Councils, that will uphold Divine Truth, must Determine) doth equally give either ground or power to define Error and Truth.

N. U. M. 22.
A. C. p. 72.

To his former Questions A. C. adds, That if we leave this to be examined by any private man, this examination not being Infallible, had need to be examined by another, and this by another without end, or ever coming to Infallible certainty necessarily required in that one faith which is necessary to salvation, and to that peace and unity which ought to be in the Church. Will this inculcating the same thing never be left? I told the

* 5.32. N. 5. S. Jesuits [†] before, that I give no way to any private man to be judge of a General Council: And there also I shewed the way

53. confid. 7. N. m. 4. how an erring Council might be rectified, and the peace of the Church either preserved or restored, without lifting any private spirit above a Council, and without this process in Infirmitum (which A. C. so much urges; and which is so much declined in all [†] Sciences.) For as the understanding of a man must always have somewhat to rest upon, so must his Faith. But a || private man, first for his own satisfaction, and after for the Churches, if he have just cause, may consider of, and

[‡] Arist. i. Post. 2. x. 6. &c. 4. Deut. T. 14. §§. 28. N. 15. That an Infallible certainty is necessary for that one Faith which is necessary to salvation. And

† 5.38. N. 1. of that (as I expressed [†] before) a most infallible certainty we have already in the Scripture, the Creeds, and the four first General Councils, to which for things Necessary and Fundamental in the Faith, we need no assistance from other General Councils.

¶ Sun qui m-
ficio quod ducit
rationes sentiunt
non est opus
Generali Concilio (de Constantiensi loquitur) dictates, omnia bene & Patribus nostris Ordinata ac Constituta,
modo ab omnibus generali & fideliter servantur. Nam non squam id in summa est verisimilem. Tamen cum nihil
fieri servetur, &c. Pet. de Aliaco, L. de refutatione. Recd. fin. So that after Councils are added to Decret
for Observance, than to make any new Determinations of the Faith.

the Church in *things absolutely necessary*, we have the same infallible direction that we have for *Faith*. But in *Things not necessary*, (though they be *Divine Truths* also) if about them Christian men do differ, 'tis no more than they have done, more or less in all Ages of the Church; and they may differ, and yet preserve the * *One necessary Faith*, and † *Charity* too, entire, if they be so well minded. I confess it were heartily to be wished, that in these things also men might be all of one mind, and one judgment, to which the Apostle exhorts, || *1 Cor. i.* But this cannot be hoped for till the Church be *Triumphant* over all humane frailties which here hang thick and close about her. The want both of *Unity* and *Peace* proceeding too often, even where *Religion* is pretended, from *Men* and their *Humours*, rather than from *Things* and *Errors* to be found in them.

And so *A. C.* tells me, *That it is not therefore* (as I would persuade) *the fault of Councils Definitions*, *but the pride of such as will prefer, and not submit their private judgments, that loss, and continues the loss of peace and unity of the Church, and the want of certainty in that one afore-said soul-saving Faith*. Once again I am bold to tell *A. C.* there is no want of certainty, most infallible certainty of *That one soul-saving Faith*. And if for other opinions which flutter about it, there be a difference, a dangerous difference, as at this day there is, yet necessary it is not, that therefore, or for prevention thereof, there should be such a *Certainty*, an *Infallible Certainty* in these things. For he understood himself well that said, *Oportet esse Hereses*, *1 Cor. ii.* There must, *i Cor. ii. 19.* there will be *Heresies*. And wheresoever that *Necessity* lies, 'tis out of doubt enough to prove, that *Christ* never left such an *Infallible Assurance* as is able to prevent them: Or such a *Mastering Power* in his Church, as is able to over-awe them; but they come with their *Oportet* about them; and they rise and spring in all Ages very strangely. But in particular for that which first caused, and now continues the loss of *Unity* in the Church of Christ, as I make no doubt but that the *Pride* of men is one Cause, so yet can I not think that *Pride* is the *adequate and sole Cause* thereof. But in part *Pride* caused it, and *Pride* on all sides; *Pride* in some that would not at first, nor will not since submit their *private judgments*, where, with good Conscience, they may, and ought. And *Pride* in others that would not first, nor will not yet mend manifest, great, and dangerous errors, which with all good Conscience they ought to do. But 'tis not *Pride*, not to submit to known and gross Errors: And the Definitions of some *Councils* (perhaps the *Lateran*, *Constance*, and *Trent*) have been greater and

* Non omnis
Error in his
que fidei sunt;
est aut Infidelitas, aut Hæresis. Hol-
lot, in i Sent. q. 1. ad 4. K.

† scimus quodam quod semel imbibient
nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile
matere, sed salvo inter Collegas pacis &
concordia vinculo, quadam propria que
quod semel sicut asperata, retinere. Quod
in re nec nos viae cugant facimus, ac
legem damus, &c. S. Cypr. L. 2. Epist. 1.
Concordia que est Charitatis effectus,
est unio Voluntatum, non Opinionum.
Tho. 2. 2. q. 37. Ar. 1. c. Dissensio de di-
uisio, & de Opinionibus repugnat qui-
dam paci perfectae, in qua plena veritas
cognoscatur, & omnis appetitus comple-
bitur. Non tamen repugnat paci imper-
fectae, quia's habetur in via. Tho. 2. 2a.
q. 29. A 3. ad 2.

|| i Cor. i. 10. Phil. 2. 2.

N ti M. 24.
A. C. p. 72.

and more urgent Causes of breach of Unity, than the Pride of men hath been; which yet I shall never excuse, where-ere it is.

N. U. M. 25. How far this one soul-saving Faith extends, A. C. tells me I have confessed it not a work for my Pen: But, he says, it is to be learned from that One, Holy, Catholike, Apostolike, always Visible, and Infallible Romane Church; of which the Lady, once doubting, is now fully satisfied, &c. Indeed (though A.C. sets this down with some scorn, which I can easily pass over) tis true that thus I said. There is a Latitude in Faith, especially in reference to different mens Salvation? But to set a Bound to this, and strictly to define it; just thus far you must Believe in every particular, or incur damnation, is no work for my Pen. Thus I said, and thus I say still. For though the Foundation be one and the same in all, yet a Latitude there is, and a large one too, when you come to Consider not the Foundation common to all, but things necessary to many particular mens Salvation. For to whomsoever God hath given more, of him shall more be required, || S. Luc. 12. as well in Belief, as in Obedience, and Performance. And the gifts of God, both ordinary and extraordinary, to particular men, are to various, as that for my part I hold it impossible for the ablest Pen that is to express it. And in this respect I said it with Humility and Reason; That to set these Bounds, was no work for my Pen. Nor will I ever take upon me to express that Tenet, or Opinion (the denial of the Foundation onely excepted) which may shut any Christian out of heaven. And A. C. I believe you know very well, to what a narrow Scantling, some + Learned of your own side bring the very Foundation it self, rather than they will lose any that lay hold on Christ, the Son of God, and Redeemer of the World. And as Christ Epitomizes the whole Law of Obedience into these two great Commandments; The love of God, and our Neighbour, S. Mat. 22. So the Apostle Epitomizes the whole Law of Belief into these

¶ S. Luk. 12. 48. Unigenitus secundum proportionem suam secundum differentiationem Scientie vel Ignorantiae, &c. Et postea Extenditur doctrina haec, non solum ad Doctrinam Scientie, &c. Catech. in S. Luk. 12. Ecce quomodo Scientia aggravat Culpam. unde Gregorius. Or. Gor. ran. in S. Luk. 12. Therefore many things may be necessary for a knowing mans Salvation, which are not so for a poor ignorant soul. Si quis de Antecessoribus nostris vel ignoraret, vel simpliciter non hoc obseruavit, & tenuit, quod nos Dominus facte exemplo & magisterio suo docuit, potest simpliciter ei us de Indulgencia Domini Venit concedi. Nobis vero non poterit significari, qui nunc a Domino admisimus & instruimus. S. Cyprian. L. 2. Epis. 3.

* S. 38. Num. 1.

+ Articuli Fidei sunt sunt Principia per se nota. Et sicut quodam eorum in aliis implicite continentur ita omnes Articuli implicite continentur in aliquo primis creditibus, &c. strandum illudad Heb. 11. Tho. 2. 24. q. 1. A. 10. c. Is. ab soluto nobis & facile est aeternum: Jam suscitatus a mortuis per Deum credere, & ipsum esse Dominum confidere, &c. S. Hilari. L. 10. de Trin. ad finem. S. Matth. 22. 37.

two great Alleluts: That God is; and That he is a rewarder of them that seek him: Heb. 11. that seek him in Christ. And S. Peter was full of the Holy Ghost, when he exprest it, That there is no salvation to them that seek it in, or by another Name, Acts 4. 12. *A. C. 4.* But since this is no work for my Pen, it seems A. C. will not + And yet before in this Conference, & apud A. C. p. 42. the Jesuite say tis a work + for his. whom he defends hath said it expressly, that above are Fundamental which are necessary to Salvation. But

But he tells us, * 'Tis to be learned of the One, Holy, Catho- * A.C. p. 72.
like, Apostolike, always Visible, and Infallible Romane Church.
Titles enough given to the Romane Church; and I wish she
deserv'd them all, for then we should have peace. But 'tis
far otherwise. One she is, as a particular Church, but not The
One. Holy she would be counted; but the world may see, if it
will not blinde it self, of what value Holiness is in that *Country*
and *Country*. Catholike she is not; in any sense of the word; for
she is not the + Universal, and so not Catholike in ex-
tent. Nor is she found in
Doctrine, & in things wh^t
come neer upon the *Foundation* too; so not || Catho-
like in Belief. Nor is
she the Prime Mother-
Church of Christianity; * Jerusalem was that;
and so not Catholike as
a Fountain, or Original,
or as the Head, or Root
of the Catholike.

caput. cod. L.1. Tit.2. Leg.24. That is, not simply of all Churches, but of all, in that Patriarchate. And
so Rome is the Head of all in the Romane Patriarchate.

And because many Romanists object here (though A.C. doth N U M. 29.
it not) that S. Cyprian called the + Romane Church, The Root and + Et Ecclesie
Matrix of the Catholike Church of Christ; I hope I shall have Catholica ra-
leave to explain that difficult place also. First then, S. Cyprian dicem & Ma-
names not Rome. That stands onely in the Margin, and was pla- tricem agnoscen-
ced there as his particular judgement led || him that set out S. Cyp. rent & tene-
prian. Secondly, the true Story of that Epistle, and that which L. 4. Epist. 8.
led S. Cyprian into this Expression, was this. Cornelius then cho- || Edit. Basili-
sen Pope, expostulates with S. Cyprian, That his Letters to Rome
were directed onely to the Clergie there, and not to Him; and
takes it ill, as if S. Cyprian had thereby seemed to disapprove his
Election. S. Cyprian replies; That by reason of the Schism
mov'd then by Novation, it was uncertain in Africk which of
the Two had the more Canonical Right to the See of Rome;
and that therefore he nam'd him not: But yet that during this
uncertainty, he exhorted all that sailed thither, ut Ecclesie Catho-
like Radicem & Matricem agnoscerent & tenearent; That in
all their carriage they should acknowledge, and so hold them-
selves unto the Unity of the Catholike Church, which is the Root
and Matrix of it, and the onely way to avoid participation in
the Schism. And that this must be S. Cyprian's meaning, I shall
thus prove. First, because, This could not be his meaning or
Inten-

† Romana Ecclesia particularis. Bellar. L. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 4. § 1.
Catholica autem est illa que diffusa est per universam Orbi. S. Cyril.
Hierosol. Catech. 18.

|| Catholica enim dicitur Ecclesia illa que universaliter docet sine ullo
defectu, vel differentia dogmatum. S. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. 18. unde
Augustinus subscriptus in Episcopum Catholica Ecclesie Hippo-
genensis, L. 1. de Actis cum Felice Manich. c. 20. Et l. 2. c. 3. Et Catholica Alter-
mondinorum. Soz. L. 1. Hist. 9. Et l. 2. c. 3. And so every particular
Church is or may be called Catholike, and that truly, so long as
it teaches Catholike Doctrine. In which sense the Particular Romani
Church was called Catholike, so long as it taught all and only those
things to be de fide, which the Catholike Church it self main-
tain'd. But now Rome doth not so.

* Suprad. S 35. Num. 9. Other Churches beside the Romane are cal-
led Matrisard Originales Ecclesie, as in Tertul. de priscript. ad. Heli-
ref. c. 21. Et Ecclesia Hierosolymitana que aliarum omnium Mater.
¶ ut et. &c. Theodoret. L. 5. Hist. Eccl. c. 9. ex Libello Synodus a
council. Constantinopol. 2. transmisse ad Concilium sub Damaso tum Roma
coactum. Et Constantinopolitanis Ecclesia dicitur omnia aliarum

¶ cap. 29.

Intention; That the *Sea of Rome* was the Root or Matrix of the Catholike Church. For if he had told them so, he had left them in as great, or greater difficulty, than he found them. For there was then an Open and an Apparent Schism in the Church of Rome. Two Bishops, Cornelius and Novatian; Two Congregations, which respectively attended and observed them. So that a perplexed Question must needs have divided their thoughts, which of these Two had been that Root and Matrix of the Catholike Church. Therefore had S. Cyprian meant to pronounce *Rome* the Root and Matrix of the Catholike Church, he would never have done it at such a time, when *Rome* it self was in Schism. Whereas in the other sense, the Counsel is good and plain, Namely, that they should hold themselves to the Unity and Communion of the Catholike Church, which is the Root of it. And then necessarily they were to suspend their Communion there, till they saw how the Catholike Church did incline, to approve, or disapprove the Election of the One, or the Other. And thus S. Cyprian frees himself to *Cornelius* from the very least Touch of schism.

* Baron. An. ad. 254. Num. 64. where he cites this Epistle. Secondly, Because this sense comes home to * Baronius. For he affirms that S. Cyprian and his Colleagues the African Bishops did Communionem suspendere, suspend their Communion until they heard by *Caldonius & Fortunatus*, whose the undoubted right was. So it seems S. Cyprian gave that Counsel to these Travellers, which himself followed. For if *Rome*, during the Schism, and in so great uncertainty, had yet been *Radix Ecclesiae Catholice*, Root of the Catholike Church of Christ, I would fain know, how S. Cyprian, so great and famous an Assertor of the Churches Unity, durst once so much as think of suspending Communion with her. Thirdly, Because this sense will be plain also by other Passages out of other Epistles of S. Cyprian. For writing to *Jubaianus* an African Bishop against the Novatians, who then infested those parts, and durst Rebaptize Catholike Christians, he saith thus.

Noi autem quia Ecclesia unus Caput & Radix sumus, dicem nemini, pro certa scientia, & credibili, nihil extra Ecclesiam licet, & Baptismatis quod est unum, Caput nos esse, ubi & ipse Baptizatus est. S. Cyprian. ad Jubain. Epist. 73. Edit. Pamili.

+ But we who hold the Head and Root of One Church, do know for certain, and believe, that nothing of this is lawful out of the Catholike Church; And that of Baptism, which is but One, we are the Head, where he himself was at first Baptized, when he held the Ground and Verity of Divine Unity. Now I conceive 'tis all one, or at least as Argumentative to all purposes, to be *Caput* or *Radix Baptismatis*, Head or Root of Baptism, as Head or Root of the Church. For there's but One Baptism, as well as but One Church, and that is the entrance into this. And S. Cyprian affirms and includes himself, *Nos esse Caput*, that we are the Head of Baptism. Where yet (I pray observe it) he cannot by *Nos*, We, mean his own Person (though if he did, he were the more Opposite to *Rome*) much less can he mean the *Romane Church*, as it is a Particular, and stands separate from others. For then how could he say, *Nos esse Caput*, that

that we are the Head? Therefore he must needs mean the Unity and Society of the Church Catholike, which the Novatians had then left, and whereof he and his Church were still Members. Besides most manifest it is, that he calls that Church *Caput Baptismatis* the Head of Baptism, where Novatian was Baptized (they are his own words) and probable it is that was Rome, Because that Schismatick was a *Roman Priest*. And yet for all this S. Cyprian says, *Nos esse Caput Baptismatis*, that we are the Head of Baptism, though he were at *Carthage*. By which it is plain, That as *Caput* is parallel to *Radix*, and *Matrix*: So also that by *Caput*, the head of Baptism, he includes together with *Rome* all the other members of the *Church Universal*. Again, S. ^{*}Cyprian writes to *Cornelius* and censures the Schismatical carriage of the Novatians at *Rome*. And tells him farther, that he had sent *Galdonius* and *Fortunatus* to labour Peace in that *Church*, that so they might be reduced to, and composed in the Unity of the Catholike *Church*. But because the *Obstinate*, and *inflexible pertinacity* of the other Party had not only refused *Radicis & Matrix sinum*, the bosome of their Mother and embracings of their Root, but the *Schism* increasing and growing raw to the worse, hath set up a *Bishop* to it self, &c. Where tis observable, and I think plain, That S. Cyprian employed his *Legates* not to bring the *Catholike Church* to the communion of *Rome*, but *Rome* to the *Catholike Church*. Or to bring the Novatians not only to Communicate with *Cornelius*, but with the *Church Universal*, which was therefore *Head* and *Root* in S. Cyprian's judgment, even to *Rome* it self, as well as to all other, Great, Ancient, or even *Apostolical Churches*. And this is yet more plain by the sequel. For when those his *Legats* had laboured to bring those *Schismaticks* to the *Unite of the Catholike Church*; yet he complains their Labour was lost. And why? Why? because *recusabant Radicis & Matrix sinum*, they refused the Bosome of the Root, and the Mother. Therefore it must needs be, that in S. Cyprian's sense, these two *Unitas Catholica Ecclesie*, the unity of the Catholike *Church*. And *Radix*, or *Matrix*, *sinus*, or *Complexus*, the Bosome, or Embracing of the Root, or the Mother, are all one. And then *Radix* and *Matrix* are not words by which he expresses the *Roman Sea*, in particular, but he denotes by them the *Unity of the Church Catholike*. Fourthly, Because Tertullian seems to me to agree in the same sense. For saith he, *these so many and great Churches founded by the Apostles*, taken all of them together, are that *One Church* from the *Apostles* out of which are *All*. So all are *First*, and *All Apostolike*, while they all allow and prove *Universalitatem, One Unity*. Nor can any possibly understand this of any Particular *Church*,

<sup>* Elaboravit
ut ad Catholicam
et Ecclesiam uni-
tatem (ad)
cuporis mem-
bra compre-
hendere & Chri-
stiane chari-
tatem vinculari
cooperari. Sed
quoniam di-
verse partes
obstinata &
inflexibilis
pertinacia non
tantum Radicis
& Matrix si-
num adeo com-
plexum recusa-
vit, sed etiam
episcopatum & in-
presa repara-
tione discor-
did, Episcopatu-
m continetur,
&c. S. Cypr.
L. 2. Ep. 1. 10.</sup>

t ut ac tunc Ecclesia. Unde est illa ab
Abdolis primogenita quid Omnes. Sic omnes
priores, & omnes Apostolice, dum unam
omnes probant Unitatem; Tert. de pref.
adon. Heret. ad. Porro unam est pri-
mam Apostolicam quid reliqua. Hanc
nulli loco affigit. Et Rhenanus Auctor, in
Argumento, Tert. de prescript. &c. Nulli
loco therefore not at *Rome*. But these
words [Hanc nulli loco affigit] delin-
ctor, says the Spanish Inquisition upon
Riccius, printed at Madrid An. 1584

but

but subordinately. As S. Gregory Nazianzen says the Church of

^{*Greg. Nazian.} Cesarea was *Mater, the Mother of almost all Churches*, which must needs be understood of some Neighbouring Churches, not of the whole Catholike Church. And where †Pamelius speaks of *Original and Mother-Churches*, he names six, and others, and *Rome* in the last place: Therefore certainly no Particular Church can be the *Root or Matrix of the Catholike*; But she is rooted in her own *Unity*, down from the *Apostles*, and no where else *extra Denum*. And this is farther manifest by the *Irreligious act* of the *Emperour Adrian*. For he intending to root out the *Faith of Christ*, took this course. He Consecrated *Simulacrum Iovis*, the *Image of Jupiter* in the very place where Christ suffer'd, and profaned *Bethleham* with the *Temple of Adonis*. || To this end,

^{¶ Migne's R.} ^{dix. 27. Epist. 18.} ^{¶ Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 1. cap. 1. § 1.} ^{¶ in loco lat. eius in quibus christus natu. &c.} ^{S. Paulini Epist. 1. ad Scram.} ^{¶ Migne's R.} ^{dix. 27. Epist. 18.} ^{¶ Heret. omnes de illa exierunt tanquam in magna scatellis deinceps.} ^{Ipsa autem radice in Radice sua. S. Aug. de Symb. ad Corinthus. L. 1. c. 6.} ^{¶ Migne's R.} ^{dix. 27. Epist. 18.} ^{¶ Heret. omnes de illa exierunt tanquam in magna scatellis deinceps.} ^{Ipsa autem radice in Radice sua. S. Aug. de Symb. ad Corinthus. L. 1. c. 6.} ^{¶ Migne's R.} ^{dix. 27. Epist. 18.} ^{¶ Heret. omnes de illa exierunt tanquam in magna scatellis deinceps.} ^{Ipsa autem radice in Radice sua. S. Aug. de Symb. ad Corinthus. L. 1. c. 6.}

that the *Root*, or it were, and the *Foundation* of the *Church* might be taken away, if in these places *Idols* might be worshipped, in which Christ himself was born, and suffered, &c. By which it is most evident, That either *Jerusalem* was the *Root of the Catholike Church*, if any Particular *Church* were so; Or rather, that *Adrian* was deceived, (as being an *Heathen* he well might) in that he thought the *Universal Church* had any particular or *Local Root* of its Being: Or that he could destroy it all by laying it waste in any one place whatsoever. And S. *Augustine* I think is full for this. That the *Catholike Church* must have a *Catholike Root* or *Matrix* too. For he tells us, That all *Heresies* whatsoever went out de illa, out of the *Catholike Church*. For de illa there can be out of no other. For all *Heresies* did not go out of any one *Particular Church*. He goes on. They were cut off de *Vite*, from this *Catholike Vine* still, as *unprofitable Branches*. *Ipsa autem*, but this *Catholike Church* remains in *Radice sua*, in *its own Root*, in *its own Vine*, in *its own Charity*, which must needs be as ample, and as *Catholike* as it self. Or else, were it any *Particular*, All *Heretical Branches* could not be cut off from one *Root*.

^{+ Pars Donati non considerat praeclarum esse a Radice Orientalem Ecclesiarum, &c. S. Aug. Ep. 170. p. 11.} And S. *Augustine* says again, + That the *Donatists* did not consider that they were cut off from the *Root* of the *Eastern Churches*. Where you see again, tis still but *One Root* of many *Churches*: And that if any man will have a *Particular Root* of the *Catholike Church*, he must have it in the *East*, not in the *West* at *Rome*. And now lastly, besides this out of S.

^{¶ Cyprian to prove his own meaning, (and sure he is the best interpreter of himself) and other assilting Proofs, 'tis most evident, that in the prime and principal sense, the *Catholike Church*, and her *Unity*, is the *Head, Root, or Matrix of Rome*, and all other *Particular Churches*; and not *Rome*, or any other *Particular*, the *Head, Root, or Matrix* of it. For there is a double *Root* of the *Church*, as there is of all things else: That is, *Radix Essentia*, the *Root, Head, or Matrix* of its *Essence*. And this is the *prime sense*. For *Essence* and *Being* is first in all things.}

And then there is *Radix Existentie*, the Root of its Existence, and formal Being, which always presupposes Being; And is therefore a *sense less Principal*. Now to apply this. The Catholike or Universal Church is, and must needs be the Root of Essence and Being to *Rome*, and all other Particulars. And this is the Principal Root, Head, or Matrix that gives Being. And *Rome*, but with all other Particular Churches, and no more than other Patriarchal Churches, was and is *Radix Existentie*, the Root of The Churches Existence. And this agrees with that known and received Rule in Art: That Universals give Essence to their Particulars, and Particulars supply their Universals with Existence. For as *Socrates* and every Particular man borrow their Essence from the Species and Definition of a man, which is Universal, but this Universal Nature and Being of Man hath no actual Existence but in *Socrates* and all other particular men: so, the Church of *Rome*, and every other particular Church in the world, receive their very Essence and Being of a Church from the Definition of the Catholike Universal Church of Christ; But this Universal Nature and Being of the Church hath no actual Existence but in *Rome* and all other Particular Churches, and equal Existence in all her particulars. And should all the Particular Churches in the world fall away from Christ, save onely One (which God forbid) yet the Nature, Essence, and Being of the Universal Church would both Exist and subsist in that one Particular. Out of all which to me most clear it is, That for the Churches Being, the Catholike Church, and that in Unity (for Ens & Unum, Being, and Being one, are Convertible) is *Radix*, the Root, Head, Matrix, Fountain, or Original (call it what you will) of *Rome*, and all other Particular Churches. But *Rome* is no more than other Churches, the Root, or Matrix of the Catholike Churches Existence, or Place of her actual Residence. And this I say for her Existence only, not the purity or form of her Existence, which is here not considered. But if the Catholike She be not, nor the root of the Catholike Church, yet Apostolike I hope She is. Indeed Apostolike She is, as being the Sea * of One, and he a Prime Apostle. But then not Apostolike, as the Church is called in the Creed from all the Apostles, no nor thet Only Apostolike, Viz.

* Not as Bel-larmino would have it, with a *Hinc dicitur Apostolica, quia in ea Successio*

Ecclesiarum ab Apostolis adiuncta est usque ad nos, Bellar. L. 4. de notis Ecc. c. 8. §. 1. For by this Reason neither Jerusalem, nor Antioch were in their times Apostolike Churches. Because Succession of Bishops hath not succeeded in them to this day. *De Colloge agebatur qui possent, &c.* Judicio Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum eam integrum reservare, S. Aug. Epist. 162. Jo. de Turrecrem. numerat sex Verbi huius significaciones. Quarum prima est. Apostolica dicitur quia in Apostolis, &c. initata est. Hos enim instituit quasi fundatum Ecclesia, &c. Jo. de Turrecrem. L. 1. Summa, c. 18. Et quia Originem habet ab Apostolis, &c. Ibid. ubi dicit etiam S. Piores apposuisse hanc Vocem [Apostolicam] in Symbolo suo, supra symbolum Apostolorum, ibid.

+ Ecclesia Apostolica, ut Smyrneorum, &c. reliqua ab apostolis fundata, Tertul. de prescript. advers. Heret. c. 32. Per curia Ecclesias Apostolicas, &c. Habet Corinthum, Philippas, Thessalonicenses, Ebedium, Romanam, ibid. c. 32. Et Pamelius numerat Hierosolymitanum, Antiochenam, Corinthianum, Philippenum, Ebedianum, Romanam. Pamel. ib. c. 21. Num. 129. And it may be observed, that so long ago Hierusalem, and so lately Pamelius should should reckon *Rome* last. Quia & alia Ecclesiae que ab his Apostolicis etiam deputantur, ut scholas Ecclesiarum Apostolicarum, &c. Tertul. ib. c. 20.

sib! c I may not deny God hath hitherto preserved Her, but for a better end doubtless than they turn it to. But Infallible She was never: Yet if that Lady did as the Jesuite in his close avows, or others will rest satisfied with it, who can help it? Sure none but God. And by A.C.'s leave this (which I said, is no work for my Pen) cannot be learned, no not of the One, Holy, Catholike, and Apostolike Church, much less of the Roman. For though the Foundation be one and the same, and sufficiently known by Scripture and the Creeds; Yet for the building upon the Foundation, the adding to it; the Detracting from it; the Joyning other things with it; The grating upon it: Each of these may be damnable to some, and not to others, according to the Knowledge, Wisdome, means of Information which some have, and others want: And according to the ignorance, simplicity, and want of Information, which some others have, and cannot help: And according to the Negligence, Contempt, Wilfulness, and Malice, with Obsturacy, which some have against the Known Truth; and all or some of these in different degrees in every particular man. And that in the whole Latitude of mankind, from the most wise and learned in the School of Christ, to the simplest Idiot that hath been so happy as to be initiated into the Faith by Baptism. Now the Church hath not this knowledge of all particulars, Men, and Conditions, nor can she apply the Conditions to the Men. And therefore cannot teach just how far every man must believe, as it relates to the possibility, or impossibility of his salvation in every particular. And that which the Church cannot teach, men cannot learn of her. She can teach the Foundation, and men were happy if they would learn it, and the Church more happy would she teach nothing but that as necessary to Salvation; for certainly nothing but that is Necessary. Now then whereas after all this, the Jesuite tells us, that

F. Upon this and the precedent Conferences, the Lady rested in judgment fully satisfied (as she told a confident Friend) of the Truth of the Roman Churches faith. Yet upon frailty and fear to offend the King, she yielded to go to Church; for which she was after very sorry, as some of her friends can testify.

9. 39. B. This is all personal. And how that Honourable Lady N.H.M. 1. was then settled in Conscience, how in Judgement, I know not. This, I think, is made clear enough, That that which you said in this and the precedent Conferences could settle neither, unless in some that were settled or settling before. As little do I know what she told any confident friend of her approving the Roman cause. No more whether it were frailty, or fear, or other Motive

Motive that made her yield to go to Church, nor how sorry she was for it, nor who can testify that sorrow. This I am sure of, if she repent, and God forgive her other sins, she will more easily be able to Answer for her coming to Church, than for her leaving of the Church of England, and following the superstitions and errors which the Romane Church hath added in Point of Faith, and the Worship of God. For the Lady was then living, when I answered thus.

Now whereas I said, the Lady would far more easily be able to answer for her coming to Church, than for her leaving the Church of England; To this A. C. excepts, and says, That I neither prove, nor can prove, that it is lawful for one (perswaded especially as the Lady was) to go to the Protestant Church. There's a great deal of Cunning, and as much Malice in this passage: but I shall easily pluck the sting out of the Tail of this Wasp. And first, I have proved it already through this whole Discourse, and therefore can prove it, That the Church of England is an Orthodox Church. And therefore with the same labour it is proved, that men may lawfully go unto it, and communicate with it; for so a man not only may, but ought to do with an Orthodox Church. And a Romanist may communicate with the Church of England, without any Offence in the Nature of the Thing thereby incurred. But if his Conscience, through mis-information, check at it, he should do well in that Case, rather to inform his Conscience, than forsake any Orthodox Church whatsoever. Secondly, A.C. tells me plainly, That I cannot prove that a man so perswaded as the Lady was, may go to the Protestant Church; that is, That a Romane Catholike may not go to the Protestant Church. Why, I never went about to prove that a Romane Catholike being and continuing such, might against his Conscience, go to the Protestant Church. For these words (A man perswaded as the Lady is) are A.C.'s words; they are not mine. Mine are not simply that the Lady might, or that she might not: but Comparative they are, That she might more easily answer to God for coming to, than for going from the Church of England. And that is every way most true. For in this doubtful time of hers, when, upon my Reasons given, she went again to Church; when yet soon after (as you say at least) she was sorry for it. I say, at this time she was in heart and resolution a Romane Catholike, or she was not: If she were not, (as it seems by her doubting she was not then fully resolved) then my speech is most true, that she might more easily answer God for coming to Service in the Church of England, than for leaving it. For a Protestant she had been, and, for ought I knew, at the end of this Conference, so she was; and then twas no sin in it self to come to an Orthodox Church; nor no sin against her Conscience, she continuing a Protestant, for ought which then

appeared to me. But if she then were a *Romane Catholike*, (as the *Jesuite* and *A.C.* seem confident she was) yet my speech is true too. For then she might more easily answer God for coming to the *Church of England*, which is *Orthodox*, and leaving the *Church of Rome*, which is *Superstition*, than, by leaving the *Church of England*, communicate with all the *Superstitions of Rome*. Now the *cunning* and the *malignity* of *A.C.* lies in this: He would fain have the world think that I am so *Indifferent in Religion*, as that I did maintain, the *Lady*, being conscientiously persuaded of the *Truth of the Romish Doctrine*, might yet, against both her *conscience*, and against open and avowed *profession*, come to the *Protestant Church*.

NUM. 3.

M. C. p. 73.

Nevertheless, in hope his *cunning Malice* would not be discovered, against this (his own sence; that is, and not mine) he brings divers Reasons. As first, 'tis not lawful for one affected as that *Lady* was; that is, for one that is resolved of the *Truth of the Romane Church*, to go to the *Church of England*; there, and in that manner to serve and worship God; Because (saith *A.C.*) that were to *halt on both sides*, to serve two Masters, and to *dissimble with God and the world*. Truly, I say the same thing with him; And that therefore neither may a *Protestant*, that is resolved in *Conscience*, that the *profession* of the *true Faith* is in the *Churc of England*, go to the *Romish Churc*, there, and in that manner to serve and worship God. Neither need I give other Answer, because *A.C.* urges this against his own *fiction*, not my *assertion*. Yet since he will so do, I shall give a particular Answer to each of them. And to this *first Reason* of his, I say thus, That to *Believe Religion* after one sort, and to *practise it* after another, and that in the main points of worship, the *Sacrament* and *Invocation*, is to *halt on both sides*, to serve two Masters, and to *dissimble with God and the world*. And other then this I never taught, nor ever said that which might infer the Contrary. But *A.C.*

*Quintus queritur. An ubi Catholicae uia can Hereticorum verantur, sicutum in Catholicis adire Temples ad quae Heretici transiunt, uim indebet conservare, &c. Respondeo: Si rei Naturam possimus, non eis per se malum, sed sed natura indifferens, &c. Et postea. Si Princeps heresi laborat, & iubet subditos Catholicos sub pena mortis, ut Confessionis bonorum frequentare Temples Hereticorum, quid tam faciendum? Respondeo: si iubet rancum, ne omnes Mandato suo obediant, huius est Catholicis sacre: Quid profanat solum Catholicis officium. Sin iubat, ut in symbolo finali Religionis Hereticorum profanetur, parere non debet. Quarto iterum, An licet Catholicos obediunt, modo publice assertur si id efficiere, solum ut Princeps suo obediat, non ut sellam hereticum profanaret? Respondeo: Quidam id licet arbitratur, ne bona eius publicentur, vel Vita tripiantur. Quid sane probabilitate dici videtur. Azorius Institut. Moral. p. 2. l. 8. c. 27. p. 1299. Edit. Paris. 1616.

give me leave to tell you, your fellow *Jesuite* * *Azorius* affirms this in express terms; And what do you think, can he prove it? Nay, not *Azorius* only, but other *Priests* and *Jesuites* here in *England*, either teach some of their *Profelytes*, or else some of them learn it without teaching, That though they be persuaded as this *Lady* was, that is, though they be *Romane Catholikes*, yet either to gain honour, or save their purse, they may go to the *Protestant Church*, just as the *Jesuite* here says, *The Lady did out of frailty and fear*

fear to offend the King. Therefore I pray A. C. if this be gross dissimulation both with God and the world, speak to your fellows to leave persuading or practising of it, and leave men in the profession of Religion to be as they seem, or to seem and appear as they are; Let's have no Mask worn here. A. C.'s second Reason why one so persuaded as that Lady was, might not go to the Protestant Church, is, *Because that were outwardly to profess a Religion in Conscience known to be false.* To this I answer, first, that if this Reason be true, it concerns all men, as well as those that be persuaded as the Lady was. For no man may outwardly profess a Religion in conscience known to be false; *For with the heart man believeth to righteousness, and with the mouth he confesseth to salvation, Rom. 10.* Now to his own *Rom. 10. 10.* salvation no man can confess a known false Religion. Secondly, if the Religion of the Protestants be in conscience a known false Religion, then the Romanists Religion is so too; for their Religion is the same; Nor do the Church of Rome and the Protestants set up a different Religion (for the Christian Religion is the same to both) but they differ in the same Religion: And the difference is in certain gross corruptions, to the very endangering of salvation, which each side lays the other is guilty of. Thirdly, the Reason given is most untrue; for it may appear by all the former Discourse to any Indifferent Reader, that Religion, as it is professed in the Church of England, is neareast of any Church now in being to the Primitive Church: And therefore not a Religion known to be false. And this I both do and can prove, were not the deafness of the Asp upon the ears of seduced Christians in all humane and divided parties whatsoever.

After these Reasons thus given by him, A. C. tells me, That I neither do nor can prove any superstition or error to be in the Romane^{*} Religion. What none at all? Now truly I would to God from my heart this were true, and that the Church of Rome wore so happy, and the whole Catholike Church thereby blessed with Truth and Peace. For I am confident such Truth as that would soon either Command Peace, or confound Peace-Breakers. But is there no Superstition in Adoration of Images? None in Invocation of Saints? None in Adoration of the Sacrament? Is there no error in breaking Christ's own Institution of the Sacrament, by giving it but in one kinde? None about Purgatory? About Common Prayer in an unknown tongue none? These and many more are in the Romane Religion, (if you will needs call it so.) And 'tis no hard work to prove every of these to be Error, or Superstition, or both. But if A. C. think so meanly of me, that though this be no hard work in it self, yet that I

NUM. 4.

A.C. p. 73.

* I would

A.C. would

call it the Ro-

mane Peoplis,

or, as some

understand-

ing Romanists

do.

† For though I spare their Names, yet can I not agree in judgment with him that says in Prior: God be praised for this disagreement in Religion. Nor in Devotion with him that prayed in the Pulpit: That God would tear the Rent of Religion wider. But of S. Greg. Nis. opinion I am. O! let us love &c. Non habemus paci in dissimilans vita Domini — ut facilitat, & mansuetudinis faciat colligamus. — Et rursum, Pacem talibus legitime pugnau, &c. Orat. 32.

(such)

(such is my weakness) cannot prove it; I shall leave him to enjoy that opinion of me, or what everelse he shall be pleased to entertain, and am far better content with this his opiniot of my *weaknes*, than with that which follows of my pride; for he adds, *That I cannot prove any Errour or Superstition to be in the Romane Religion, but by presuming, with intolerable pride, to make my self or some of my fellows to be Judge of Controversies, and by taking Authority to censure all to be Superstition and Errour too, which suites not with my fancy, although it be generally held, or practised by the Universal Church. Which (faith he) in is. Augustine's judgment is most insolent madness.* What, not prove any superstition, any Errour at Rome, but by pride; and that *Intolerable?* Truly I would to God A. C. law my heart, and all the pride that lodges therin. But wherein doth this *Pride* appear, that he creatures me so deeply? Why first in this, *That I cannot prove any Errour or Superstition to be in the Romane Religion, unless I make my self or some of my fellows Judge of Controversies.* Indeed if I took this upon me, I were guilty of great *Pride*. But A. C. knows well, that before in this Conference, which he undertakes to Answer, I am so far from making my self or any of my fellows *Judge of Controversies*, that * *I absolutely make a lawful and free General Council Judge of Controversies, by, and according to the Scriptures.* And this I learned from † S. Augustine, with this, *That ever the Scripture is to have the prerogative above the Council.* Nay, A. C. should remember here, that || he himself taxes me for giving too much power to a *General Council*, and binding men to a *strict Obedience* to it, even in Case of *Errour*. And therefore sure most innocent I am of the most intolerable pride, which he is pleased to charge upon me; and he, of all men, most unfit to charge it. Secondly, A. C. will have my pride appear in this, that I take *Authority* to censure all for *Errour* and *Superstition*, which suites not with my own fancy. But how can this possible be, since I submit my judgment in all humility to the *Scripture* interpreted by the *Primitive Church*, and upon new and necessary doubts, to the judgment of a *lawful and free General Council*? And this I do from my very heart, and do abhor, in matters of *Religion*, that my own, or any private mans fancy should take any place, and least of all against things generally held or practised by the *Universal Church*, which, to oppose in such things, is certainly (as * S. Augustine calls it, *Insolentissime insanie*, an Attempt of *most insolent madness*). But those things which the *Church of England* charges upon the *Roman Party* to be *superstitious* and *erroneous*, are not held or practised, in, or by the *Universal Church* generally, either for *time* or *place*. And now I would have A. C. consider how justly all this may be turned upon himself. For he

* S. 33.

5.26. M.1.

or 11.

† *Proprium**Scriptura, &c.*

S.Aug.L.2. &

Bapt. cont. Do-

nat. c. 3.

I 5.32. M.5.

A.C. p.63.

M. M. M.

2.2. 2.2.

blow. I *

A.C. p.13.

he hath nothing to pretend, that there are not gross Superstitions and Errours in the Romane Perswasion, unless by intollerable pride he will make himself and his Party Judge of Controversies, (as in effect he doth; for he will be judged by none but the Pope, and a Council of his ordering) or unless he will take Authority to free from Superstition and Errour whatsoever suites with his fancy, though it be even Superstition it self, and run crois to what hath been generally held in the Catholike Church of Christ; Yea, though to do so, be, in S. Augustine's judgment, most insolent madnes. And A. C. spake in this most properly when he called it taking of Authority; For the Bishop and Church of Rome have in this particular of judging Controversies, indeed taken that Authority to themselves, which neither Christ, nor his Church Catholike did ever give them. Here the Conference ended with this Conclusion.

And as I hope God hath given that Lady mercy: so I heartily pray that he will be pleased to give all of you a Light of his Truth, and a Love to it, that you may no longer be made Instruments of the Pope's boundless Ambition, and this most unchristian * brain-sick device. That in all Controversies of the * S. 33. N. 6.
Faith he is Infallible, and that by way of Inspiration and Prophecy in the Conclusion which he gives. To the due Consideration of which, and God's mercy in Christ, I leave you.

To this Conclusion of the Conference between me and the suite, A. C. says not much: But that which he doth say, is either the self same which he hath said already, or else is quite mistaken in the business. That which he hath said already, is this; That in matters of Faith we are to submit our judgments A. C. p. 73. to such Doctors and Pastors, as by Visible Continual Succession, without change, brought the Faith down from Christ and his Apostles, to these our days, and shall so carry it to the end of the world. And that this Succession is not found in any other Church differing in Doctrine from the Romane Church. Now to this I have given a full Answer * already; and therefore will not trouble the * S. 37. N. 3. 4. Reader with needless and troublesome repetition. Then he brings certain places of Scripture to prove the Pope's Infallibility. But to all these places I have likewise answered before, * S. 23. N. 3. And therefore A. C. needed not to repeat them again, as if they had been unanswerable.

One Place of Scripture onely A. C. had not urged before, either for proof of this Continued Visible Succession, or for the Pope's Infallibility. Nor doth A. C. distinctly set down by which of the two he will prove it. The Place is * Ephes. 4. Christ * Ephes 4 11. ascending gave some to be Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors & Teachers, &c. for the edification of the Church. Now if he do mean to prove the Pope's Infallibility by this place, in

- in his Pastoral Judgement; Truly I do not see how this can possibly be collected thence.

* Pontificatus Suminus discretus postum est ab Apostolo in illis verbis, Eph. 4. 11. &c. in illis claramur, 1 Cor. 12. 28. Ifse posuit in Ecclesia primum Apostolos, &c. Bellar. I. 1. de Rom. Pont. c. 1. § Respondeo Pontificatum. And he gives an excellent reason for it. Siquidem summa potest esse Ecclesiastica non solum data ab Petro, sed etiam alius Apostolis. Ibid. So belike, by this reason, the Apostle doth clearly express the Popedom because all the rest of the Apostles had as much Ecclesiastical Power, as St. Peter had. But then Bellarmine would have it up with this, That this Power is given Petro, ut Ordinatio Petri cui succederet, alius virus tanquam Delegatus, quibus non succederet. Ibid. But this si meer begging of the Question, and will never be granted unto him. And in the mean time, we have his absolute Confession for the other, That the Supreme Ecclesiastical Power was not in St. Peter aliter, but in all the Apostles.

† Ephes. 4. 13. O sicut enim ergo

Christ gave some to be Apostles for the Edification of his Church. Therefore St. Peter, and all his Successors, are Infallible in their Pastoral Judgement. And if he mean to prove the Continued Visible Succession, which, he saith, is to be found in no Church but the Romane, there's a little more shew; but to no more purpose. A little more shew: Because it is added

vers. 13. That the Apostles, and

Prophets, &c. shall continue at their work (and that must needs be by Succession) till we all meet in unity and perfection of Christ. But, to no more purpose. For tis not laid that they, or their Successors should continue at this work in a personal, uninterrupted Succession in any one Particular Church, Romane, or other. Nor ever will A. C. be able to prove that such a Succession is necessary in any one particular place. And if he could, yet his own words tell us, the Personal Succession is nothing, if the Faith be not brought down without change from Christ and his Apostles to this day, and so to the end of the world. Now here's a piece of Cunning too, The Faith brought down unchanged. For if A. C. mean by the Faith, the Creed, and that in Letter; tis true, the Church of Rome hath received and brought down the Faith unchanged from Christ and his Apostles to these our days. But then tis apparently false, That no Church differing from the Romane in Doctrine hath kept that Faith unchanged, and that by a visible and continued Succession. For the Greek Church differs from the Romane in Doctrine, and yet hath so kept that Faith unchanged. But if he mean by the Faith unchanged, and yet brought down in a continual visible Succession, not only the Creed in Letter, but in Sense too; And not that only, but all the Doctrinal Points about the Faith, which have been Determined in all such Councils as the present Church

* And so also of Rome allows: (* as most certainly he doth so mean, and tis the Controversie between us:) then tis most certain, and most apparent to any understanding man that reads Antiquity with an impartial eye, that a Visible Continual Succession of Doctors and Pastors have not brought down the Faith in this sense from Christ and his Apostles to these days of ours in the Romane Church. And that I might not be thought to say, and not to prove, I give instance. And with this, that if A. C. or any Jesuite can prove, That by a Visible Continued Succession from Christ and his Apostles to this day, either Transubstantiation in the Eucharist;

Or

Or the Eucharist in one kinde ; Or Purgatory ; Or worship of Images ; Or the Intention of the Priest of necessity in Baptism ; Or the Power of the Pope over a General Council ; Or his Infallibility with, or without it ; Or his Power to depose Princes ; Or the publicke Prayers of the Church in an unknown tongue ; with divers other Points have been so taught , I, for my part, will give the Cause. Beside, for Succession in the general I shall say this . 'Tis a great happiness where it may be had *Visible* and *Continued*, and a great Conquest over the Mutability of this present world. But I do not finde any one of the *Ancient Fathers* that makes *Local*, *Personal*, *Visible*, and *Continued Succession* , a *Necessary Signe* or *Mark* of the true *Church* in any one place. And where * *Vincentius Lirinensis* calls for *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*, cont. *Hes. c.4.* as great Notes of Truth, he hath not one word of *Succession*. And

for that great place in † *Irenæus*, where that *Ancient Father* reckons the Succession of the *Bishops of Rome* to *Elentheirus*, (who fale in his time) and saith, *That this is a most full and ample prooff or Oftension, Vivificatricem Fidem, that the Living, and Life-giving Faith is from the Apostles to this day Conserved and delivered in Truth* ; And of which place || *Bellarmino* boasts so much. Most manifest it is in the very same place, that

* *Irenæus* stood as much upon the Succession of the Churches then in Asia, and of Smyrna (though that no prime Apostolical Church) where Polycarpus fale Bishop, as of the Succession at Rome. By which it is most manifest, that it is not Personal Succession onely, and that tyed to one Place, that the Fathers meant, but they taught, that the Faith was delivered over by Succession in some places or other still to their present time ; And so doubtless shall be, till Time be no more. I say, *The Faith* ; But not every Opinion , true or false , that in tract of time shall cleave to the *Faith*. And to the *Faith* it self, and all it's Fundamentals , we can shew as good, and full a Succession as you ; And we pretend no otherwise to it than you do, save that We take in the *Greeks*, which you do not. Only we reject your gross Superstitions, to which you can shew no Succession from the Apostles , either at *Rome* or else-where , much less any one uninterrupted. And therefore he might have held his peace that says, *It is evident that the Roman Catholike Church only hath had a Constant and uninterrupted Succession of Pastors, and Doctors, and Tradition of Doctrine from Age to Age.* For

† Hac Ordinatione & Successione ea que est ab Apostolis in Ecclesiis Traditio, & veritatis preconia-
tio peruenit usque ad nos. Et est plenissima hac O-
stele, unam & eandem Vivificatricem fidem esse,
que in Ecclesiis ab Apostolis usque nunc fit conser-
vata, & tradita in veritate. Iren. L.3. Advers.
Hes. c.3.

¶ Per hanc Successionem confundi omnes Hereticos.
Bellar. L.4. de Notis Eccles. c.8. § 1. There's no such word found in *Irenæus*, as per hanc Successionem, or Hac Successione, in the Church of Rome onely, which is *Bellarmino*'s fence : But by Succession in general in other Churches , as well as in *Rome*.

* Testimonium his peribent quæ sunt in Asia Ecclesie Omnes, qd qui usque adhuc Successerunt Polycarpo. Iren. L.3. adver. Her. c.3. Constat omnem Doctrinam qua cum illis Ecclesiis Apostolicis, Marciabibus, Originalibus Fidei conferret, Veritati di-
putandum. Tertul. de prescript. aduers. Heretic. c.21. Ecclesia posteriores non minus Apostolice di-
putantur pro consanguinitate Doctrinae. Ibid. c.32. Ecclesia non in Paricibus confundit, &c. Ecclesia autem illis erat, ubi fides vera erat. S. Hieron. in Psal.133.

most evident it is, That the Tradition of Doctrine hath received both Addition and Alteration, since the first five hundred years in which † Bellarmine confesses, and B. Jewel maintains the Churches Doctrine was Apostolical.

NUM. 8. And once more before I leave this Point. Most evident it is, That the Succession which the Fathers meant, is not tyed to place or Person, but tis tyed to the Verity of Doctrine.

* Ad hanc formam provocabuntur ab illis Ecclesiis, que licet nullum ex Apostolis vel Apolliniis Autorem suum prouferant, ut multo resipue quod deinceps quotidie instituerunt, tamen in eadem siue confitentes, non minus Apostolicae dignitatem pro conseruacione Doctrinae, Tertul. de praescr. c. 32.

to Christ, all the Succession become strangers, what nearness soever they pretend. And † Irenaeus speaks plainer than he.

+ Illi Presbyteris obedientiam est, qui cum Episcopatus Successione Charisma accepimus Veritatem, Iren. Lib. 4. cap. 4. Notab. 1.

¶ Successio sec. Locorum tantum est, ne personam, sed etiam veram & sane Doctrinam, Stapl. Reff. Controv. 1. 4. 4. s. 2. Notab. 1.

be of true and sound Doctrine also. And had he stayed here, no man could have said better, But then he saw well he must quit his great Note of the Church-Succession; That he durst not doe. Therefore he begins to cast about, how he may answer these Fathers, and yet maintain Succession. Secondly, therefore he tells us, That that which these Fathers say, do nothing weaken Succession, but that it shall still be a main Note of the true Church & in that sense which he would have it. And his Reason is.

* Because sound Doctrine is inseparable from true and lawful Succession, Where you shall see this great Clerk (for so he was) not able to stand to himself, when he hath forsaken Truth. For 'tis not long after, that he tells us, That the People are led along, and judge the Doctrine by the Pastors; But when the Church comes to examine, she judges the Pastors by their Doctrine. And this + he says is necessary, Because a man may become of a Pastor, a Wolf. Now then let Stapleton take his choice. For either a Pastor in this Succession cannot become a Wolf, and then this Proposition's false; Or else if he can, then sound Doctrine is not inseparable from true and Legitimate Succession: And then the former Proposition's false, as indeed it is. For that a good Pastor may become a Wolf, is no new in the Ancient Story of the Church, in which are registered the Change of many * Great men into Heretics, I spare their

[†] Nam & Pastoribus Lupus fieri potest. Stapl. Ibid. Notab. 4.

* Vincent. L. r. cont. Hes. c. 23. 24. folia

their Names; And since *Judas* chang'd from an *Apostle* to a *Devil*, S. John 6. 'tis no wonder to see others change from *Shepherds* into *Wolves*: I doubt the Church is not empty of such *Changelings* at this day: Yea but *Stapleton* will help all this. For he adds, *That suppose the Pastors do forsake true Doctrine, yet Succession shall still be a true Note of the Church; Yet not every Succession, but that which is legitimate and true.* Well: And what is that? Why, * *That Succession is lawful which is of those Pastors, which hold entire the Unity and the Faith.* Where you may see this *Sampson's* hair cut off again. For at his word I'll take him. And if that onely be a *Legitimate Succession* which holds the *Unity* and the *Faith* entire, then the Succession of Pastors in the *Romane Church* is illegitimate; For they have had + more *Schisms* among them than any other Church: Therefore they have not kept the *Unity* of the Church. And they have brought in gross *Superstition*: Therefore they have not kept the *Faith* entire. Now if A. C. have any minde to it, he may do well to help *Stapleton* out of these *briars*, upon which he hath torn his *Credit*, and I doubt his *Conscience* too, to uphold the *Corruptions* of the *Sea of Rome*.

As for that in which he is quite mistaken, it is, *his Inference*, NUM. 9. which is this. *That I should therefore consider carefully, Whether it be not more Christian, and less brain-sick, to think that the Pope, being S. Peter's Successour, with a General Council should be Judge of Controversies, &c. And that the Pastoral Judgment of him should be accounted *Infallible*, rather than to make every man that can read the Scripture, Interpreter of Scripture, Decider of Controversies, Controller of General Counsels, and Judge of his Judges:* Or to have no Judge at all of Controversies of Faith, but permit every man to believe as he list. As if there were no *Infallible* certainty of Faith to be expected on earth; which were, instead of one saving Faith, to induce a *Babylonical Confusion* of so many faiths, as fancies; Or no true Christian Faith at all. From which Evils, Sweet Jesus deliver us! I have considered of this very carefully; But this *Inference* supposes that which I never granted, nor any Protestant that I yet know; Namely, That if I deny the Pope to be *Judge of Controversies*, I must by and by either leave this *supream Judicature* in the hands and power of every *private man* that can but read the Scripture; or else allow no Judge at all, and so let in all manner of *Confusion*. No, God forbid that I should grant either: For I have expressly * declared, That the *Scripture interpreted by the Primitive Church, and a lawful and free General Council determining according to these*, is *Judge of Controversies*: And that no *private man* whatsoever, is, or can be Judge of these. Therefore A. C. is quite mistaken (and I pray God it be not wilfully, to beguile poor Ladies, and other their weak adherents, with seeming to say somewhat) I say, quite mistaken, to infer,

that I am either for a private Judge, or for no Judge; for I utterly disclaim both, and that as much, if not more than, he, or any Romanist, whoever he be. But these things in this passage I cannot swallow. *First*, That the Pope with a General Council should be Judge; for the Pope in Ancient Councils never had more power than any the other Patriarchs: Precedency, perhaps for Orders take, and other respects, he had. Nor had the Pope any Negative voice against the rest in point of difference. *No*, nor was he held superior to the Council. Therefore the ancient Church never accounted or admitted him a Judge; no, not with a Council, much less without it. *Secondly*, it will not down with me, that his Pastoral judgement should be Infallible; especially since some of them have been as Ignorant, as many that can but read the Scripture. *Thirdly*, I cannot admit this neither (though he do most cunningly thereby abuse his Readers:) That any thing hath been laid by me, out of which it can justly be inferred, *That there's no Infallible certainty of Faith to be expected on earth*. For there is most Infallible certainty of it, that is, of the Foundations of it in Scripture and the Creeds. And 'tis so clearly delivered there, as that it needs no Judge at all to sit upon it, for the Articles themselves. And so entire a Body is this one Faith in it self, as that the Whole Church (much less the Pope) hath not power to add one Article to it, nor leave to detract any one the least from it. But when Controversies arise about the meaning of the Articles, or Superstructures upon them, which are Doctrines about the Faith, not the Faith it self (unless where they be immediate Consequences) then both in and of these a * Lawful and free General Council, determining according to Scripture, is the best Judge on earth. But then suppose uncertainty in some of these superstructures, it can never be thence concluded, *That there is no Infallible certainty of the Faith it self*. But 'tis time to end, especially for me, that have so Many Things of Weight lying upon me, and disabling me from these Polemick Discourses, beside the Burden of sixty five years complicit, which draws on apace

* Patron &
Avorum nostrorum temporum
pontificum et conciliorum. Papam esse iupa-
ponit, 2 mil. 3. de Gallo. P. C. de S. 1.
illius responsatio scimus, quia Romani
Papam, nihil ad aliquos annos
fuit, Generalis, sed prius, videlicet iusta-
rurum. Exaudiens. In. 5. Non autem
Papam esse nos fons sive Concilium
General, sed & generalis Ecclesiam
est propositio scire de Fide. Bellar.
L. 2. ac concil. c. 19. S. 1.

+ Hoc hoc tempore nullus sit Roma Tu-
famur qui faciat litteras ac didicatur, quia
fronte aliquis eorum docere audebit, quod
deo erat. A. Miln. 15. Concil.
Rhenanus. Nam cum antiqui plures homines
ad eum litteratos essent, ut Grammaticam u-
niuersitas ignorarent, quod si ut sacra Litteras
interpretari possit? Alphon. à
Castro, L. 1. admod. Hist. c. 4. vnu-
sus medium Edit. Paris. 1554. (For
both that at Antwerp An. 1556, and
that at Paris, An. 1571, have been
in Purgatory.) And such an ignorant as
these was Pope John the four and twen-
tieth, Platino. in vita ejus. E. S. 23. N. 6
|| Reolutio Occam. q. Quid non tota
Ecclesia, nec Concilium Generale, nec
Summus Pontifex, possit facere Articu-
lum, quod non fuit Articulus. Sed
Ecclesia bene determinata de Pro-
positionibus Catholicis, de quibus tracta-
bamus, &c. Ja. Almain. in. 3.
Sent. D. 25. q. unica. Idem opere,
ad ea que pertinet ad fidem nostram,
& nequam ex voluntate humana de-
pendent, non potest Summus Pontifex,
nec Ecclesia de assertione vel, ve-
ram: nec de non falsa falliam facere. sed
non potest de non Catholicis Catholicam
facere, nec de non Catholicis Hereticam.
Et ideo non potest utrum Articulum fac-
ere, nec Articulum Fidem tollere. Quo-
niam scitur Veritas Catholicis ab
qua omnis approbat. Ecclesia ex natu-
re rei sunt immutabiles, & immutabilis
est vera, ita sunt immutabiles Catholicis
reputanda. Similiter siue Hereti-
ces ab quo omni reprobatione, & damnati-
tione sunt falsa, sed ab quo omni reprobatione
sunt Heretici reputanda, &c.
potest. Patet ergo quod nulla Veritas
est Catholicis ex approbatione Ecclesie
vel Papae. Gab. Didac. 3. Sent. Did. 43.
q. unica. Art. 3. Bk. 3. vers. 15. p. 1.
+ S. 26. Num. 1.

Psal. 90. 10. - In voto ad illibato

et mortalis dolo non habeo. sed vobis singulis
vobis et modicum osiup. yet i (and we mō yet o grām)
1613

and to the Time, that I must go, and give *God*, and *Christ* an Account of the *Talent* committed to my Charge; In which *God*, for *Christ Jesus* sake, be merciful to me, who knows, that however in many Weaknesses, yet I have with a faithful and single heart (bound to his *free Grace* for it) laboured the Meeting, the Blessed Meeting of *Truth* and *Peace* in his *Psal. 85. 10.* Church, and which *God*, in his own good time, will (I hope) effect. To *Him* be all Honour, and Praise for ever:
A M E N.



F I N I S.



223
 And to the Land wher I wulf be, and give God, and carry on
 Accord of the people conuerted to the Churche; In which
 City, the Country ffor the pke, be meselues to me, who know
 their powerfull in many Waterfle, yet I have writ & sent
 and thynke ffor (sonde to the place for it) powerte the
 Churche; this Prelatte Waterfle of thynke and leare in this land
 Cuntry, for myt selfe in his owne good tyme, will (I
 hope) shew. To this be all Honour, and thanks for ever

YMBW

RICKES



A Table of the principal Contents.

- A** Fricanes : their opposing the Romane Church, and separating from it, 112, &c. they are cursed and damned for it by Eulalius, and this accepted by the Pope, Ibid. S. Augustine involved in that curse, 113
Ja. Almain against the Popes Infallibility, 172. his absurd Tenet touching the belief of scripture, and the Church, 53
Alphonsus à Castro his confession touching the Popes fallibility, 173 his moderation touching heretike, 17. his late Editions forewdly purged, 173
S. Anselme Archbishop of Canterbury how esteemed of by Pope Urban the second, 111
Apocrypha : some Books received by the Trent-Fathers, which are not by Sextus Senensis, 218
Of Appeals to forreign Churches, 110, III, 112. no Appeal from Patriarchs or Metropolitans, ib.
Aristotle falsly charged to hold the mortality of the Soul, 72
Arians : the large spreading of them, 179. wherein they dissented from the Orthodox Christians, 201
Assistance : what promised by Christ to his Church, what not, 60, 106, &c. 131, &c. what given to his Church and Pastors thereof, 62, 64, 156, 157, 166, 233
Assurance infallible even by humane proof, 80, 81
S. Augustine cleared, 22, 37, 88, 93, 54, 82, 110, 123, &c. righted, 89, 158, 159, 229, his proofs of scripture, 65
The Author his small time to prepare for this conference, 15. his submission to the Church of England and the Church Catholike, 150, 151. the Rule of his faith, 246. pride imputed to him, and retorted upon the imputors, 246, 347
B Aptism : of anointing, use of spittle, and three dippings in it, 44. that of Infants how proved out of scripture, 36, 37. acknowledged by some Romanists that it may be proved thence, 37. the necessity of it, 36. how proved by tradition, and S. Augustine's minde therein, 37, 38. that by Hereticks, Schismaticks, and Sinners, not theirs but Christ's, 195
S. Basil explained, 59
Beatitude supreme, how to be attained, 73
Belief of some things necessary before they be known, 51. Vid. Faith.
Bellarmine : his cunning discovered and confuted, 7, 8, 9, 136. his dissent from Stapleton, 26. and from Catharinus, 32, his absurd and

B

C

- and impious tenet touching belief of scripture consulted,* 56
Berengarius: his gross recantation, 214
S. Bernard righted, 88, 89
Biel: his true assertion touching things that be de Fide, 252
Bishops: their calling and authority over the Inferior Clergy, 114, 115. *their places and pre-cedencies ordered,* Ibid. *the titles given them of old,* 110. *all of the same merit and degree,* 131
Bodies representing and represented: their power, privileges, &c. compared together, 150, &c.
Britannia, of old not subject to the Sea of Rome, 111, 112. *S. Gildas his testimony concerning the Antiquity of the conversion of it,* 203. *and that testimony vindicated,* Ibid. 171

C

- C Alvin and Calvinists for the Real presence,* 191, &c. 193
Campanella his late Eclogue, 138
Campian his boldness, 94
Canterbury: the ancient place and power of the Archbishops thereof, 111, 112
Capellus: his censure of Baronius, 98
Certainty: vid. Faith.
Certainty of Salvation: vid. Salvation.
Christ's descent into Hell: vid. Descent.
Church: whereon founded, 8, 9. *wherein it differeth from a General Council,* 18. *no particular one infallible,* 3, 4, 58, 59, &c.

C

- not that of Rome,* 3, 4, 6, 7, &c. 11, 12. *Catholike Church: which is it,* 203. &c. *her declarations, what fundamental, what not,* 20. *how far they binde,* 20, 21. *her authority not divine,* 22. *not in those things wherein she cannot erre,* 42. *wherein she cannot universally erre,* 90, 91, 104, 157. *what can take holiness from her,* 91, 92. *in what points of faith she may erre,* 104, 105. *her errors & corruptions, how and by whom caused,* 126. *what required of her that she may not erre,* 127. *she in the Common-wealth, not the Common-wealth in her,* 132, &c. *how she must be always visible,* 207. *the invisible in the visible,* 90. *of her double Root,* 240, 241. *what the opinion of the Ancients concerning it,* 237, 238, &c. 240. *A Church, and the Church, how they differ,* 82, 83, 84, &c. *by what assistance of the spirit the Church can be made infallible,* 58. *the authority of the Primitive compared with that of the present Church,* 52. *Church of Cæsarea her title given by Gregory Naz.* 110
Greek Church, vid. G.
Church of England a part of the Catholike, 104, &c. *where her Doctrine is set down,* 22, 23. *her Motherly dealing with her Children,* Ibid. *her Articles and Canons maintained,* 33. *of her positive and negative Articles,* 34, 35. *her purity,* 245. *how safe to communicate with her,* 243. *what Judges and Rules in things spiritual she hath and acknowledged,* 138. *how she is wronged by the Romane,* 204. *Salvation more*

certain in her than in the Ro-
mane. 212, &c.
How one particular Church may
judge another, 108, &c. mutual
criminations of the Eastern and
Western, 116
A Church in Israel after her se-
paration from Judah, 97
Church of Rome wherein she
hath erred, 12, 58. sometimes
right, not so now, 83. though
she be a true Church, yet not
Right or Orthodox, 82, 83. her
want of charity, 16, 17. her de-
termining of too many things,
the cause of many evils, 32, 33:
her severity in cursing all other
Christians, 33, 34. how far she
extendeth the authority of her te-
stimony, 41. her rash condemning
of others, 90, 92. how she and
how other Churches Apostolike,
242. how corrupted in Doctrine
and Manners, 95, 96. she not the
Catholike Church, 120, 240;
241. false titles given her, 237.
her belief how different from
that of the ancient Church, 213.
other Churches as well as she
called Matres and Originales Ec-
clesiae, 237. A Church at Jeru-
salem, Antioch, and (probably)
in England before one at Rome,
103. Cardinal Peron his absurd
tenet that the Romane Church is
the Catholike causally, 104. vid.
Errours. Pope. Rome. And
Concomitancy in the Eucharist,
vid. Eucharist. : enqiuicid
Conference: the occasion of this,
1, 2, the Jesuites manner of deal-
ing in this and in two former, 311
Confessions. Negative, made by
Churches in what case needful,
101
Controversies: that in them con-

188

Councils their fallibility, 150, 158,
162, 163, &c. 225. the infallibility they have is not exact but congruous infallibility, 166.
whence, and where it is principally resident, 166, 172. none of the present Church absolutely infallible, 59. confirmation of them by the Pope, a Romane novelty, 128. who may dispute against them, who not, 22, 23. how, inferiors may judge of their decrees, 161. a general Council the onely fit judge of the present Controversies, 136, 139. and how that to be qualified, 99, 101, 127,
145, 146 &c. the Bishop of Rome not always President in general Councils, 140, 141. what impediments have been and now are of calling and continuing them, 129. what confirmation they need, 127, 128, 147. what of them lawful, what not, 141, &c. what obedience to be yielded to them erring, 146, 147, 168,
169, &c. what's the newest they can do, 20. the words *Visum est Spiritui sancto & Nobis*, not used by any posterior Council, 153. the first and later Councils differently affisted, 156, 166.
whence they have their power and assistance, 150, &c. the prior may be amended by the posterior, 158, &c. what doees of them are necessary to be believed, 161. how they are held by the Romanists to be infallible, 163. their decrees by Stapleton held to be the Oracles of the Holy Ghost,
in that sense to no error, 156.

C

156. that they are not Prophetical in their conclusions, 163, 164. of their necessity and frequency, 128 alias they may corrupt the whole Church not erring, 168. their errors how to be amended, 101. how worse of no worth at all by the Romantists without the Pope, 170. Councils and Fathers: how we are sure we have their true copies, 216, 217. Conclusions of Councils how to be believed, 226. their determinations not all of equal authority, 234. by whom they were and ought to be called, 140, 141. against the Popes being above a general Council, 218, 252. Conditions required to make a Council lawful, 142, 143. Protestants intituled to one upon doubtful and dangerous terms, 92
 Of the Council of Florence, and the Greeks their subscribing to it, 227. Council of Constance: their injurious proceeding against Husse, &c. 92, 93. Because his absence of it confused, ibid. its great errors touching Communion in one kind, 52, &c. 170. Council of Nice: the absence of the Western Bishoppes from it how preumpmced, 144. Council of Africa in S. Cyprian's time erred about Baptism by Heretics, 158. Council of Trent & how occasioned, and what amonstrated, 399. not general nor legal, and for null, 140, 143. compared with ancient Councils, 26, 27, 142, 143, &c. the blinde persistency of the Fathers there, 93. her dangerous and wilful error concerning the intention of those that administer the Sacraments, 179,

D

180. claimed by Soto and Vega for their contrary Tenets, 32, of things there determined, 24. where the Pope ought not to have sat as President, 140, 141. Bishops made of purpose to make a major part there, 143. more Italian Bishops in it than of all Christendome beside, ibid. its addition of twelve new Articles to the Creed, 222. Creed: that it is a Rule of faith, 27. that it is wholly grounded on Scripture, 29. some words added to it, why, and by whom, 9. Trenetis his famous testimony of it, 218. Athanasian Creed expounded and vindicated, 210, 223. 3. Cyprian cleared, 3, &c. and 6 and righted, 237. 3. Cyril of Alexandria vindicated, 8, 9. D. Demonstrative reasons of greater force than any other humane proof, 161. direct proof and demonstrative how they differ, 35. Descent of Christ into Hell, how held by the Church of England, and how by those of Rome, 29, 30, 198. Difficult and difference in opinion, what may stand with the peace of the Church, 234, 235. Disputations: their use, 82. when and how lawful for a private man to dispute with the whole Church, 84. publike disputations how safe or available, 94, 95. in what case to be admitted between the English and the Romish Clergy, 94. Divinity

Divinity: that it hath a science above it, and what, 79. the Principles of it otherwise confirmed than those of any other art,

67, 68, 78, 79

Donatus: two of that name, 196

Donatists compared with the Romanists, 194, 195, 196, whether any of them living and dying so had possibility of salvation, and which, 195, 196. whether they were guilty of Heresy, ibid.

E

Emperour: whom the Jesuites would have to be, 233, 237
vid. Pope.

Epiphanius cleared and vindicated, 121, 122

Errors not fundamental to whom and in what case damnable, 208, 209, 242. Errors of Councils vid. Councils. Errors of the Romane Church wanting all proof from ancient Councils and Fathers, 221, &c. 250. what be the most dangerous of them, 245. Errors of Papists, to whom fundamental, 217. vid. Church of Rome.

Eucharist: a threefold Sacrifice in it, 199, 200. mutilated by the Romane Church, 12, 170, 171. upon what hard terms the Bohemians were dispens'd with to have it in both kinds, 198. the Papists tyed by their own grounds to believe of it as the Church of England doth, 187, &c; the Church of England and other Protestants believe Christ's real presence in it, 188, 289, &c. 191, 192, 193. Concomitancy in it. Thomas of Aquin's fiction confuted, 198. Bellarmine's

notorious contradiction of Christ's being in it corporally present, 192 to 193. his new and intricate Doctrine touching Transubstantiation, 213, 214. of the unbloody Sacrifice and the bloody how they differ, 199, 200. the propitiatory and gratulatory Sacrifice how they differ, 199, 200. Expositions: such only right as the thing expounded containeth, 20. The Extravagance censured, 139

Faith: how it is unchangeable, and yet hath been changed, 7. what is certain by the certainty of it, 25, 26. not to be termed the Romane, but the Christian or Catholike Faith, 88, &c. the two Regular precepts of it, 27. of its prime Principles, and how they differ from the Articles of it, 28. the last Resolution of it, into what it should be, 41, 42, &c. 57, 65, 66, 215, 223, 224, &c. Faith acquired & faith infus'd, wherein either or both required, 233. how few things are essential to the Faith, 234, 235. how its Principles differ from those of sciences, 67. its foundation the Scripture, 34. by it man brought to his last happiness, 68, 70, 71. how by it the understanding is captivated, 72. that it is an act produced by the will, 48, 68. the Principles of it have sufficient evidence of proof, 77. It and Reason compared in their objects, &c. 164, &c. a latitude in it in reference to different mens salvation, 212, 236. things of two sorts belonging to it, 24. what by it to be believ'd explicitly, what not, 217, 218. of the perfection and certainty of it, 252.

F : G

HISTORICAL

of things: not necessary to salvation no infallible Faith can be among men, 233. foundation of Faith, how broken, 233. how frustrated by those of Rome, 59. the Catholique word now Romane Faith, not both one, 220. Faith of Scripture to be Gods Word, inspired by the Holy Ghost, 47, 48. the true grounde of it, 71, 72, 73, 74. our Faith of it, how it differes from that of those who wrote Scripture, 70, 71. Faith of Scripture that it hath all perfections needed, 72, 73, 74. how firm and infallible it is, 72, 73, 74, 75. Felicity: what it is, and that the soul of man is capable of it, 72. Ferus his acknowledgement of the difference 'twixt the first Coun-cells and the late ones, 156. Fundamental: what maketh a point to be such, 19, 20, 22. that de-crees of Councils are not such, 87. what points be so, and what not, 17, 18, 21, 22, 27, &c. 217, 218. not all of a like primeness, 28. all Fundamentals held by the whole Church, 18. Points not Funda-mental, how and to whom neces-sary to salvation, 18, 19. Firm and Fundamental how they dif-fer,

1

C Erton his ingenuity, 99
Holy Ghost how said to be
lost, 14. his procession from the
Son added to the Creed by
the Romane Church, 16, 97.
the Greek Church her error
touching this, 14. what and how
dangerous, 16
God: proof of the true one by te-

Simony of the false ones, 50
Government of the Church in what sense Monarchical, in what Aristocratical, 130, 131, &c. how a Monarchical not needful, 138
§. Gregory Naz. vindicated, 131
his humility and mildness, 110
Pope Gregory VII. the raiser of the Papacy to the height, 135,
136. his XVIII. conclusions
The height of the Papal greatness, did 178
Creek Church notwithstanding her error, still a true Church, 16.
and justified by some Romanists, under bare usage by the Church of Rome, 17. of her Bishops their subscription to the Council of Florence, 237

Heresies: what maketh them,
to the occasion of their
first springing up, 128. how,
and by whom begun in Rome, 10,
and under. 105. 111.
Hereticks who, and who not, 105.
none so be rashly condemned for
such, 107. that some may pertain
to the Church, 105. who they be
that teach that faith given to
Heresies is not to be kept, 92, 93
Saint Hierome explained, 5, 88. in what
estates he had Bishops, 115
Hooke's righted, 58, 57, 158

S^r. James believed to have been
Successor of our Lord in the
Principality of the Church, 122
Idolaters; their gods how put down
by Christian Religion, 30, 31. I-
dolatry how maintained in the
Church

Church of Rome; and with what evil consequents, 181, &c.
of Judenias the Greek Patriarch
his Censure, 145
Jesuites their manner of dealing in
this Conference, 211. their coun-
ning in expounding the Fathers
to their own purpose, 7. their
confidence, 15. their Arrogancy,
and their subtle malicity, 244.
their attributing to themselves
Infallibility, 61. their desire of
having one King among Popes, 85,
66. their late cunning argument
to draw Protestants to them an-
sidered, &c. 194. their falsification
of the Authors words, 86, 87.
a perfect Jesuitism, 84
Jews: the ground of their belief of
the old Testament, 79
Images: how worshipped by the
Church of Rome, 12. against ad-
oration of them, 181. Cassander
his complaint of it, 182. The
flying from Image-worship should
not make us to run into pro-
phaneness and irreverence against
God, 183
Infallible: two acceptations of it, 80
Infallible and Firm how they dif-
fer, 127. the evils ensuing the
opinion of the Churches and the
Popes Infallibility, 143, &c. 170,
179. what an Infallibility of the
Church Stapleton is forced to
acknowledge, 166, 167
Vid. Councils: and Pope: and
Church.
Innocent the third: his extolling
the Pope above the Emperor,
134, &c.
against Invocation of Saints, 181
Irenaeus vindictious, 118, &c. 249,
250, 251
Invent a Church after her separation

from Judah, M
Judge: who to be in controversies
touching faith and manners,
101, &c. 2, Sec. 108, 253. what
Judges of this kind the Church
hath, 127, 253. who to judge
when a general Council cannot be
had, 129. that no visible Judge
can prevent or remedy all Heresy
and Schism, 130. A visible living
Judge of all Controversies whe-
ther always necessary, 130. &c.
wherein private men may judge,
and wherein not, 2, 149, 160.
281. being their main Argument
intended to shew, that a visible
Judge is necessary to correct Heresy
and Schism, 130, 253. Answer
and vindication to such a Note.

The Keys to whom given, and
how, 123, 167
Kings: Custodes utriusque tabula,
134. not to be tyranniz'd over
by the Pope, 125. their supre-
macy in things spiritual, 134.
some Romantics for the depoing
and killing of them, 221
Knowledge of God, how difficult,
71, 72. what Knowledge need-
ful to breed faith, 55, 56. what
degree of it is necessary to sal-
vation, hard to determine, 212,
226. the Apostles Knowledge
how different from that of their
beaters, 69
L

Against Limbus Patrum, 198
213
Litera Communicatorie, what they
were, and of what use, 132
Peter Lombard condemned of He-
resy by the Pope, 174

Maldo.

Maldonate answered, 147
Manichees : their foul Heresi-
sie, and what troubled them, 51
Manners : Corruption in them no
sufficient cause of separation, 94, 95
Martyrs : of the Feasts made of old
as their Oratories, 182
Mass : the English Liturgy better
and safer than it, 201. what man-
ner of sacrifice it is made by
them of Rome, 200
Matrix and Radix in St. Cyprian
not the Roman Church, 238, 240
Merits against their condignity, 185
Miracles : what proofs of Divine
truth, 48, 69. not wrought by all
the Writers of Scripture, 69. what
kind of assent is commonly given
to them, ibid.
Multitude : no sure mark of the
truth, 198

N

Novatians, their original, 3, 10.
Novatian: how dealt with by
Saint Cyprian, 23, 239, &c.

Obedience : of that which is due
to the Church & her Pastors, 155
Occham : his true Resolution touch-
ing that which maketh an Arti-
cle of faith, 354
Origen : his Errors obtruded by
Rufinus, 6. he the first Founder
of Purgatory, 227, 231

P

Papists : their denying possibility
of salvation to Protestants con-
futed, and their reasons answer-
ed, 185, 186, 187. of their go-
ing to Protestant Churches, and
joining themselves to their As-
semblies, 244
Parents : their power over their
children, 103

Parliaments : what matters they
treat of and decree, 138, 139
Pastors lawfully sent, what assistance
promised to them, 61, 62. their
Embassie of what authority, 64
Patriarchs all alike supreme, 111,
112, 116. no appeal from them,
ibid, 117, 118, 119
People, the unlearned of them sa-
ved by the simplicity of faith, 105
Perfidia, the different significations
of it, 4, 5, 6
St. Peter of Cherso prayer for him,
106, 107, 124, 125. of his Pri-
macy, Preeminity, and Power,
121, &c. 123, 152. in what sense
the Church is said to be built up
on him, 122. that he sell, but not
from the faith, 123, 124. whe-
ther he were universal Pastor,
125. The highest power Ecclesi-
astical how given to him, and how
to the rest of the Apostles, 109,
110, 247, 248
Pope not infallible, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11,
12, 38, 59, 124, 147, 253. how
improbable and absurd it is to
say he is so, 174, 175, &c. he
made more infallible by the Ro-
manists than a general Council,
172. his infallibility held by
some against Conscience, 174,
175. if he had any, it were use-
less, 177. how opposed by Al-
phonse à Castro, 172, 173. the
belief and knowledge of it both
of them impossible, 177. that he
may erre, and hath erred, 136.
that he may erre as Pope, 174,
175. prefer'd by some before a
general Council, 172. not Mo-
narch of the Church, 132. he hath
not a negative voice in Councils,
253. made by some as infalli-
ble without, as with a general
Con-

Council, 172, 173. his confirmation of general Councils, of what avail, 180. of his power in France and Spain, 132, 133, 136. how much greater he is made by some than the Emperour, 132, 133, &c. 137. his power slighted by some great Princes, 132, 133, 136. whether he may be an Heretick, and being one how to be dealt with, 176. all his power, prerogatives, &c. indirectly denied by Stapleton, 30
 Popes: the fall of some of them, and the consequents thereof, 95. Of their Power and Principality, 109, 110, &c. 253. their subjection to the Emperour, 115, 116. and how lost by the Emperor, 117. and how recovered, 118. primacy of order granted them by Ecclesiastical Constitutions, but no Principality of power from Christ, 109, 110. some of them opposed by the African Church, 112. some of them Hereticks, 124. some Apostates, 173. some false Prophets, 174. how unfit Judges of Controversies, 162, 163, 254. the lewd lives of many of them, 172. Pope Liberius his clear testimony against the Popes Infallibility, 173.
 Prayer: what requisite that it may be heard, 127, 154, 155. Prayer for the dead, that it presupposeth not Purgatory, 162.
 Preachers: how their Preaching to be esteemed of, 64. none since the Apostles infallible, 232.
 Precious: their opposition to lawful Ceremonies occasioned by the Romonists, 183. that there be of them in the Romane Church no less than in the Protestants, 87. their agreement in many things, 64.

Princes: the moderation and equity of all that are good, 103. the power of Sovereign Princes in matters Ecclesiastical, 111. all of the Clergy subject to them, 134.
 Prophecy: the spirit of it not to be attained by study, 163; 164.
 Protestants: why so called, 87. of their departing from the errors of the Roman Church, 86; 87. On what terms invited by Rome to a general Council, 92, 93. their charitable grant of possibility of salvation in the Romane Church, met with uncharitableness by the Roman party, 184, 185. they that deny possibility of salvation to them confuted, 186, 187. their Faith sufficient to salvation, 212.
 Purgatory: not thought on by any Father within the three first hundred years, 227. not presupposed by Prayer for the dead, ibid. Origin the first Founder of it, 226, 230. proof of it examined, ibid. the Purgatories mentioned by the Fathers different from that believed by Rome, 228, 229. the Fathers alleged for it, cleared, 227. Sec. the Papists their blasphemous assertion touching the necessity of believing it, 231. Bellarmine's contradiction touching the beginning of it, ibid.

R

Reason, not excluded or blemished by grace, 48, 49. the chief use of it, 51. what place it hath in the proof of divine Supernatural truths, 29, 48. how high it can go in proving the truth of Christian Religion; 49, 165.
 Reformation: in what case it is lawful for a particular Church to Reform her self, 96, &c. and to publish any thing that's Catholic like it,

in faith or manners, 97, 108. Examples of it, 99, 100. Reformation by Protestants how to be judged of, 99. faults incident to Reformation and Reformers of Religion, 101. who the chief binders of a general Reformation, 101. Reformation of the Church of England justified, 114. the manner of it, 100, 101. what places Princes have in the Reformation of the Church, ibid. Christian Religion: how the truth of it proved by the Ancients, 49. the propagation of it, and the firmness where it's once received, 50, 51. the evil of believing it in one sort, and practising it in another, 243, 244. yet this taught by some Jesuits and Romish Priests, ibid. one Christian Religion of Protestants and Romanists, though they differ in it, 245. private mens opinions in Religion not to be esteemed the Churches, 20. Religion as it is professed in the Church of England, nearest, of any Church now being, to the Primitive Church, 245. Resurrection: what believed by all Christians, what by some Heretics denied, 201, 202. Private Revelation, in what case to be admitted, 49. Divine Revelation the necessity of it, 73. Rhenanus purged on behalf of Rome, 239. Ridley, his full confession of the Real Presence, 193. his conviction of Archibishop Cranmers judgment touching it, 193. Romanes: who truly such and their true privilege, 4. Rome, her priests, and Super-structure in the faith, 7. See and Spain compared in their two Monarchies, 137. Heresies both begun and maintained in her, 9, 10. sovereign she hath err'd, 12. whether impossible for the Apostolike See to be removed thence, 12, 13. that she may Apostatize, 13. her definitions of things not necessary, 21. She the chief binder of a general Reformation, 114. of her pretended Sovereignty, and the bad effects of it, 102, 103, &c. what Principality and Power she hath, and whence, 109, 110, 114, &c. 120. She not the Head of the Church, nor did all Churches depend on her, 111, 112, 119. that she hath kept, nor faith nor unity inviolated, 253. whether all Christians be bound to agree with her in faith, 119. and in what case they are so, 120. the ancient bounds of her jurisdiction, 120. possibility of Salvation in her, and to whom, 118, 103, &c. the danger of living and dying in her Communion, 193, 195, 196, 197. her rigour and cruelty beyond that of Schismatical Israel, 194. her fundamental errors of what nature, 208. the Catholike Church her Head and Root, not she of it, 240, 241, 242, 243, &c.

Roman See: in what case a particular Church may make Canons with out consulting it, 98, 99, &c. 109. Romanists their cunning dealing with their Converts in fieri, 183. of their calling for a free hearing, 194, 195. their agreement with the Donatists in contracting the Church to their side, 188, 189. their danger in different respects lesser or greater than that of the Donatists, 196. Ruffi-

Ruffinus, his pernicious cunning; 6
his dissent from the Romane
Church, 10. branded by the Pope
with Heretise, 11. his words ex-
plained, 8, 9, 10

S

Sacraments: against the necessity
of his intention who administers
them, 178, 179, &c. 200, 213
Sacrilegide and Schism usually go
together, 101
Saints: against the Invocation of
them, 181. they are made by
Bellarmine to be Numina, and in
some sort our Redeemers, ibid.
Salvation: controversies amongst
the Romanists about the certainty
of it, 32
Schism: the heinousness of it, 95
who the cause of it at this day, 86
88, 126. the continuance of it
whence, 94
Schismatical Church: to live in one
and to communicate in the
Schism how different, 194. the
Protestants their leaving Rome,
no Schism, 126. of the Schism of
Israel, and those that lived there
in the time of it, 97, 194
Science supream, what, 78
Scotus righted, 20
Scripture: that it was received and
bath continued uncorrupt, 79
what books make up the Canon of
it, 11. all parts of it alike firm,
not alike fundamental, 27. that
it is the Word of God, is a prime
principle of faith, 28, &c. 75, 76,
80. the sufficiency of it, 34, 75,
76, &c. 81. how known to be
Gods Word, 38, &c.
Of the Circular probation of Scri-
pture by Tradition, and Tradition
by Scripture, 38, 75
the different ways of proving it,
39. it is a higher proof than

the Churches Tradition, 40. the
testimony proving it must be Di-
vine and Infallible, 43, 45, 47
whether it can be known to be
Gods Word by its own light, 45;
46. and that the Roman Church
by her own Tenet ought so to hold,
46. what the chief and what the
first inducement to the credibili-
ty of it, 53, 54, 57, 65, 66, 68.
the Divine light thereof, and
what light the natural man sees
in it, 53, 54. Confirmation by
double divine authority, 54, 65,
66. what measure of light is or
can be required in it, 55, 56
as now set forth and printed, of
what authority it is, 59, 63
Scripture and Tradition confirm
either other mutually, not equally,
63

The way of the Ancient Church
of proving Scripture to be Gods
Word, 65. four proofs brought
for it, ibid. the seeming contra-
diction of Fathers touching
Scripture and Tradition, recon-
ciled, 66. belief of Scripture the
true grounds of it, 71, 72, 73. rules
of finding the true sense of it, 41.
how rich a store-house it is, 73,
74. the writers of it, what cer-
tainty we have who they were,
69. proof of its Divine Autho-
rity to whom necessary, 75
infallible assurance of that Au-
thority by humane proof, 8. that
it is a Rule sufficient and infalli-
ble, 129, 130. three things ob-
servable in that Rule, 129. its
prerogative above general Coun-
cels, 157. compared with Church-
definitions, 162. what assurance
that we have the true sense of
Scriptures, Councils, Fathers,
&c., 215, 216, &c. some
Books

- Books of Scripture anciently doubted of, and some not Canonical received by some into the Canon,* 46
Separation Actual and Casual, 92, 93
 for what one Church may lawfully Separate from another, 90, 94, 95.
Corruption in manners no sufficient cause of Separation, 94, 95.
 what Separation necessary, 86
Sermons exalted to too great a height both by Jesuites and Precistans, 64, their true worth and use, *ibid.*
Simanca: his soul tenet concerning faith given to Hereticks, 93
Sixtus Senensis: his doubting of some of the Apocryphal Books received by the Council of Trent, 218
Socinianism: the monster of Hercfier, 202
Archbishop of Spalato made to speak for Rome, 231
Of the Private Spirit, 46, 47, 161
Succession: what a one a note of the Church, 249, 250, not to be found in Rome, 251. *Stapleton his inconstancy concerning it,* 250
- T
- T*estimony of the Church, whether Divine or Humane, 39
 The Testimony of it alone cannot make good the Infallibility of the Scripture, 42, 43
Theophilus of Alexandria, his worth and his violent spirit, 115
Traditions: what to be approved, 29, 30, 34, 43, 44. Tradition and Scripture-trials of the same things, 38. is not a sufficient proof of Scripture, 39, 40. it and Gods unwritten Word, not terms convertible, 43, 44. Tradition of the present Church what uses it hath, 52, 53, 55, 81. how it differeth from the Tradition of the

Primitive Church, 52, 63. Tradition of the Church meer humane Authority, 58. what Tradition the Fathers meant, by saying we have the Scriptures by Tradition, 66, 67. Tradition Apostolical, the necessity and use of it, 66, 67. Tradition how known before Scripture, 77. what most likely to be a Tradition Apostolical, 38, 39. the danger of leaning too much upon Tradition, 78. Against Transubstantiation, 180, 188, 189, 192, 212. Suarez his plain confession, that it is not of necessary belief, 188. Cajetane and Alphonsus a Castro their opinion concerning it, 221. Scandal taken by Averroes at the Doctrine of it, 212. *vid. Eucharist. True, and Right, their difference,* 82, 83

V

*V*ictor Pope taxed by Irenaeus, 118. Vincentius Lirinensis cleared, 25
Union of Christendome, how little regarded, and how hindered by Rome, 200, 212
Unity: the causes of the breaches thereof, 235, &c. Not that Unity in the Faith amongst the Romists, which they so much boast of, 218

Universal Bishop: a title condemned by S. Gregory, yet usurped by his Successors, 116

W

Word of God: that it may be written and unwritten, 43. why written, 44. uttered immediately or immediately, 43. many of Gods unwritten Words, not delivered to the Church, 44, 45. *vid. Scripture and Tradition.*

Worth of men, of what weight in proving truth, 197

A Table of the places of Scripture which are explained or vindicated.

Genesis.

Cap. i. vers. 16. pag. 136.

Deuteronomy.

**Cap. 4. v. 2. p. 21. c. 13. v. 1, 2, 3.
p. 69. c. 21. v. 19. 103. p. c. 17. v. 18.
p. 135.**

1 Samuel.

**Chap. 3. v. 13. p. 103. c. 8. v. 3, 5,
ibid.**

3 Kings.

**Cap. 12. v. 27. p. 96. c. 13. v. 11.
p. 194. c. 17. p. 193. c. 19. v. 18.
p. 194.**

4 Kings.

Cap. 3. p. 97, 193. c. 23. p. 100. 135.

2 Chron.

Cap. 29. v. 4. p. 100, 135.

Psalms.

Psal. 1. v. 2. p. 73.

Proverbs.

**Cap. 1. v. 8. c. 15. v. 20. c. 6. v. 20,
22, p. 169, 170.**

Isaiah.

**Cap. 44. & *passim*. p. 71. c. 53. v. 1.
p. 90.**

Jeremiah.

**Cap. 2. v. 13. p. 219. c. 5. v. 31. p. 78.
c. 20. v. 7. & c. 38. v. 17. p. 70.**

S. Matthew.

**Cap. 9. v. 12. p. 37. c. 12. v. 22, & c. 16.
v. 17. p. 50. c. 16. v. 18. p. 9 106.
123. 240. c. 16. v. 19. p. 47. c. 18.
v. 18. p. 123. c. 18. v. 20. p. 152, 154.
c. 18. v. 17. p. 168, 185. c. 22. v. 37,
p. 236. c. 28. v. 19, 20. p. 61, 106.
c. 28. v. 21. p. 106. c. 28. v. 29. p. 125.
c. 28. v. 20. p. 151. v. 26. v. 27.
p. 169;**

S. Mark.

**Cap. 10. v. 14. p. 38. c. 13. v. 22.
p. 69.**

S. Luke.

**Cap. 10. v. 16. p. 61. c. 12. v. 48.
p. 236. c. 22. v. 33. p. 30. c. 9. v. 43.
p. 71. c. 22. v. 37. p. 106. c. 32. v. 22.
p. 123, 151. c. 24. v. 27. p. 104.**

S. John.

**Cap. 5. v. 47. p. 79. c. 6. v. 70. p. 251.
M m 2 c. 9.**

c. 9. v. 29. p. 79. c. 10. v. 4. p. 65:
c. 10. v. 41. p. 70. c. 11. v. 42. p. 124:
c. 14. v. 16. p. 62. c. 15. c. 14. v. 26.
p. 107. c. 15. c. 16. v. 13. p. 62. c. 15.
c. 16. v. 14. p. 151. c. 17. v. 3. p. 72:
c. 19. v. 35. p. 69. c. 20. v. 22. p. 123.
c. 21. v. 15. p. 30. c. 25. c. 5. v. 31. p. 37.
c. 2. v. 19. p. 105.

2 Thes.

Cap. 2. p. 39. c. 2. v. 9. p. 70. c. 2.
v. 15. p. 46.

2 Tim.

Cap. 3. v. 15. p. 22. c. 6. v. 20. p. 44.

Afts.

Cap. 4. v. 12. p. 136. c. 6. v. 9. p. 82.
c. 9. v. 29. & c. 19. v. 17. p. 82. c. 1. r.
v. 26. p. 103. c. 13. v. 28. p. 46. c. 15.
155, 171.

Romans.

Cap. 5. v. 15. p. 22. c. 1. v. 20. p. 29,
72. c. 1. v. 8. p. 88. c. 1. v. 18. p. 222.
c. 10. v. 10. p. 245. c. 10. v. 14, 15.
p. 231. c. 3. v. 4. p. 232. c. 11. v. 16.
p. 91. c. 13. v. 1. p. 134:

I Corinthus.

Cap. 1. v. 10. p. 235. c. 2. v. 11. p. 207.
c. 3. v. 2. p. 125. c. 3. v. 11. p. 152. c. 2.
v. 14. p. 48. c. 5. v. 3. p. 166. c. 11. v. 1.
p. 61. c. 11. v. 23. p. 169. c. 11. v. 19.
p. 235, 236. c. 12. v. 3. 4. p. 47. & c. 12.
10. p. 70. & c. 12. 28. p. 247. c. 13. v. 1.
p. 134.

Galatians.

Cap. 3. v. 19. p. 43.

Ephesians.

Cap. 2. v. 20. p. 152. c. 4. v. 11. p. 247.
c. 4. v. 13. p. 248. c. 5. v. 2. p. 199. c. 5.
v. 27. p. 169. p. 45. c. 12. v. 25. p. 125.

2 Tim.

2 Tim.

Cap. 1. v. 14. p. 44. c. 6. v. 16. p. 72:

Hebr.

Cap. 5. v. 12. p. 125. c. 9. v. 12. p. 199.
c. 11. v. 6. p. 28. 236. c. 11. v. 1. p. 56.
68. c. 12. v. 9. p. 103. c. 13. v. 17.
p. 168.

S. James.

Cap. 1. v. 20. p. 99:

i S. Peter.

Cap. 5. v. 3. p. 59:

2 S. Peter.

Cap. 1. v. 16. p. 73:

i S. John.

Cap. 4. v. 2. p. 28. c. 2. v. 19. p. 105:

S. Jude.

Cap. 3. v. 46. p. 218.

Apocal.

Cap. 12. v. 1. p. 136.

F I N I S.

Cap. 2. v. 25. c. 12. v. 30. c. 9. v. 7.

W M

